

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO HUBERT L. MILLS; HOUSTON AND TEXAS SCHOOL MAN

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Thursday, July 2, 1970, the people of Texas lost a great educational administrator with the death of Hubert L. Mills, longtime business manager for the Houston Independent School District. I knew him well, having worked with him during the time that I served as assistant attorney general of Texas under Attorney General Jimmy Allred, 1931-34, who later became Governor of Texas. As assistant attorney general, I represented the school interest of Texas. Through his dedicated determination great strides were made in Texas public education. His efforts were particularly effective in improving teachers' benefits. I would like to share his accomplishments with Senators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following extracts of articles in the Houston Chronicle be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILLS SERVICES TODAY; FORMER SCHOOL MANAGER

Services for Hubert L. Mills, 80, longtime business manager for the Houston Independent School District, were scheduled for 3 p.m. today in Settegast-Kopf Kirby Dr. Chapel, 3320 Kirby Dr.

Mills, 2145 Brentwood, died Thursday in a local hospital.

He came to Houston school district in 1910 as a teacher at a salary of \$75 a month.

When he left Aug. 31, 1959, his year's pay, including \$10,250 accumulated sick leave allowance, was \$30,750. He had not missed a day of work because of illness since 1940, when he was out a week.

SHARP DIFFERENCES

His career in the late years was marked by sharp differences with some school board members. But Mills, wrinkled and nearing 70, had a quick mind and step when he left office.

Mills never married. He liked to refer to himself as "an old East Texas boy and an old bachelor."

He was born on a farm at Bush Creek, near Palestine. He attended Sam Houston State Teachers College in Huntsville and the University of Texas in Austin and went to Tarkington's Prairie in Liberty County as a mathematics teacher in 1909.

"I was mighty glad to get away from the farm," he often said. But over the years he found himself going more and more to his 400-acre farm near Fairbanks, where he raised Black Angus cattle and Tennessee Walking horses.

GOT LAW DEGREE

In 1911, a year after coming here, he was made superintendent of Houston's Common School District No. 1, which included Fullerton, Cage and Magnolia Park schools.

In 1915 Mills got his law degree from Houston Law School and practiced law briefly. He later received an honorary doctor of law degree from Southwestern University.

He fought constantly for more money for teachers, was a prime organizer of the Texas Teacher Retirement system and served as a regent of the old State Teachers Colleges.

"Good teachers will never be overpaid," he said often.

MANAGER IN 1922

When Mills became school business manager in 1922, the school budget was \$503,999 and the school census was 24,500.

Mills was a member of the Houston and Texas Bar Assns., past president of the Downtown Kiwanis Club, National Assn. of School Business Managers and the Board of Regents of State Teachers Colleges of Texas. He was a member of Holland Lodge No. 1, AF&M, and First Methodist Church and was a Shriner.

He leaves a sister, Mrs. Annie Lee Worsham, and three brothers, Judge J. W. Mills, Dr. Sam E. Mills and Coy W. Mills, all of Houston.

Burial was to be in Forest Park Lawndale Cemetery.

RESULTS OF FEDERAL SPENDING SURVEY

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, Second District, Maine, respondents to a recent opinion poll which I conducted show strong support for decreased Federal spending in the areas of foreign aid, space exploration, and defense, and for increases in pollution control, crime prevention, and health care.

A congressional newsletter sent earlier this year to all the residents of my district included a list of a dozen areas in which Federal funding plays an important role. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they felt Government spending in each area should be increased, decreased, or held at present levels.

Of the more than 10,000 forms returned, 90 percent called for increases in Federal outlays for antipollution programs. Increased spending for crime control was favored by 79 percent of all respondents, for improved health care by 59 percent, for antipoverty programs by 51 percent, and for education by 42 percent.

Reduced funding in the areas of foreign aid, space, and defense were recommended by 80, 68, and 47 percent, respectively. Thirty-nine percent of Second District respondents called for holding defense spending at present levels, and only 14 percent favored increases in defense areas.

Majorities indicated spending in the areas of cities, rural areas, and transportation should be held at current levels. Responses regarding welfare spending were evenly divided.

Results of the survey have been sent to the White House and are included below for the general information of my colleagues:

Percentage of total respondents advising increased spending by the Federal Government in the following areas: Cities, 25 percent; Crime, 79 percent; Defense, 14 percent; Education, 42 percent; Foreign Aid, 3 percent; Health, 59 percent; Pollution, 90 percent; Poverty, 51 percent; Rural Areas, 35 percent; Space, 4 percent; Transportation, 28 percent; Welfare, 32 percent.

Percentage calling for decreased spending in following areas: Cities, 17 percent; Crime, 4 percent; Defense, 47 percent; Education, 18 percent; Foreign Aid, 80 percent; Health, 8 percent; Pollution, 2 percent; Poverty, 16 percent; Rural Areas, 18 percent; Space, 68 percent; Transportation, 23 percent; Welfare, 34 percent.

Percentage recommending holding spending at present levels: Cities, 58 percent; Crime, 17 percent; Defense, 39 percent; Education, 40 percent; Foreign Aid, 17 percent; Health, 33 percent; Pollution, 8 percent; Poverty, 33 percent; Rural Areas, 47 percent; Space, 28 percent; Transportation, 49 percent; Welfare, 34 percent.

INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORTATION POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Members of Congress were privileged recently to have been presented with a new statement of international air transportation policy by President Richard Nixon. I say we were privileged, because it has been 7 years since this country's world air policy has been really looked over. Now it has been given a thorough study by experts in and out of Government, in the air industry itself, and by representatives of shippers and the traveling public.

The review of this Nation's international aviation policy was undertaken by an interagency steering committee which was chaired by the Department of Transportation. Members included representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Departments of State, Justice, Treasury, Commerce, and Defense.

I have every reason to believe that the various departments and agencies of the executive branch will move to fully implement this new policy. President Nixon, in approving the panel's recommendations, directed "that this new statement of policy guidance be used henceforth by responsible officials of the Government in dealing with international aviation problems."

Such a statement, Mr. Speaker, could have come at no better time in the calendar year. Hundreds of thousands of Americans are flying to vacation spots this summer all over the world. I have been informed by the U.S. Passport Office that about 455,000 Americans traveled to Europe in June. Most of these Americans chose to travel by airplane, utiliz-

ing both scheduled and charter carriers. We must make every effort, therefore, to support and encourage these two types of air transportation facilities for the Nation's traveling public.

In this connection, I would like to note what the statement has to say regarding the actions of some foreign governments in restricting and even turning back American planes carrying American citizens:

Attempts to restrict U.S. Carrier operations abroad should be vigorously opposed, and where required, the United States should take appropriate measures against the carriers of foreign countries restricting U.S. carrier operations in violation of the terms of bilateral agreements or of the principle of reciprocity.

In specifically discussing charger flights, the statement recommends that—

Foreign landing rights be regularized, as free as possible from substantial restriction.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is also worth noting the general tenor of the new policy which can be found near the outset of the statement:

The economic and technological benefits we seek can best be achieved by encouraging competition (the extent of competition to be determined on a case-by-case basis) and by relative freedom from governmental restrictions.

Finally, the statement recognizes concern about the quality of the environment. It expresses determination that adequate efforts be made to preserve and enhance the environment as we continue to develop the technology of air transportation.

I earnestly recommend that every Member of Congress will read this important document and indicate his support for the President in its implementation.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in 1959, Congress designated the third week of July as Captive Nations Week as a tribute and a remembrance to those peoples in many countries behind the Iron Curtain who continue to live under totalitarian governments. The 12th observance of Captive Nations Week will be held throughout the country and in 17 other free nations during July 12-18, 1970. It behooves us all to remind ourselves of the fate of those who have fallen under Communist totalitarianism lest the free world crumble bit by bit and be engulfed in the same way as those nations whose fate we now mourn.

Captive Nations Week gains special significance in 1970 since this year is the 25th anniversary of the conclusion of World War II in Europe. After all this time, no permanent just solution has yet been found for the problems which appeared in East-Central Europe as a result of the war. The Soviet Union has proposed the calling of a pan-European security conference to eliminate

the use of force or its threat from the continent of Europe. Yet this conference, as constituted in present Soviet proposals, would in essence serve only in placing a stamp of approval on post-war Soviet actions and give formal recognition to the present status quo in Europe. The Brezhnev doctrine serves as a blatant proof of Soviet intentions. A reiteration of the U.S. support of the universal application of human rights and national self-determination during Captive Nations Week would serve as an effective answer to all those governments which, by the use of force, limit or deny these rights to the people under their rule.

During 1968, several nonruling Communist parties had varying success in national elections. In May, the Italian Communist Party showed surprising strength by gaining about 800,000 votes, reaching thereby an alltime high of 26.9 percent of the vote. Although this impressive result reflected the continuing ability of the Italian Communists to attract a still sizable group of discontented Italian voters, it brought the party no closer to its longstanding goal of translating power at the polls into national governmental power. On the other hand, the important French Communist Party suffered a sharp electoral setback in June because the May-June student riots and the prolonged strikes awakened fears of a possible Communist victory among the bulk of the more conservative French voters. At the same time, the party's refusal to push for an open confrontation with the De Gaulle government alienated disaffected radicals. As a result, the French Communists lost over half a million votes as compared to March 1967 and dropped half their seats in the French National Assembly.

In the world Communist movement, 1968 will long be remembered as the year of the Czech crisis. The invasion of Czechoslovakia by five of the eight Warsaw Pact nations—U.S.S.R., East Germany, Poland, Hungary, and Bulgaria—on August 21 both widened the existing breaches in the Communist world and opened new ones. The effects of this development dominated Communist inter-party relations for the remainder of the year and prevented the already scheduled world Communist movement, notably the French Communist Party, and provided additional fuel for the perennial Sino-Soviet dispute.

Hope, courage, and love of freedom still live within the hearts of the people of the satellite nations. Deprivation of liberty does not destroy the desire for it. We have but to recall the Hungarian uprising of 1956 to become dramatically aware of this fact. The freedom-loving people of Hungary fought valiantly, but vainly, to shed their totalitarian yoke. There are perhaps millions of people who would work and struggle just as bravely for their own liberation if they were aware our sympathy were forthcoming. In the face of such courage, we must feel duty-bound to rededicate ourselves to achieving liberty for all nations of the world. We cannot permit ourselves to continue to neglect the plight of those helpless people whose aspirations for the

recovery of their liberty and independence have gone unfulfilled. The conscience of the world must not be permitted to sleep; it must be awakened and fired to meet the challenge presented by the yearning of the captive nations for their liberty.

In 1959, President Eisenhower proclaimed the first Captive Nations Week, stating:

I invite the people of the United States of America to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and I urge them to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of those captive nations.

Captive Nations Week is a noble, humanitarian cause. I am privileged to recognize and participate in this week of national observance.

A MESSAGE FOR THE FOURTH OF JULY

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, under consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the editorial written by Mr. Arvo E. Haapa, owner and publisher of the Newport Harbor Ensign, Newport Beach, Calif., entitled "A Message for the Fourth of July." I believe this deserves wide attention.

The editorial follows:

A MESSAGE FOR THE FOURTH OF JULY

The revolutionaries are saying, "America, change it or lose it." Loyal Americans say, "Love and defend our country, or leave it." If there is any change to be made, it should be a turning back to the mighty faith in God that provided the firm foundation upon which our republic was established.

On this occasion of celebrating the 4th of July signing of the Declaration of Independence 204 years ago, let us read with appreciation these words of a Wisconsin pastor, Norman Ream, quoted from the publication, Christian Economics:

"The principles of the Christian faith were built into the very fabric and structure of the American empire. One literally feels this as he reads the concluding words of the Declaration of Independence, which sound almost reminiscent of a church covenant:

"With firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

Listen to those words of a Frenchman who visited the United States in its infancy and witnessed for himself how inseparable were faith and freedom. His name was Alexis de Tocqueville, and this is what he said:

"I sought for the greatness and genius of America in fertile fields and boundless forests; it was not there. I sought for it in her free schools and her institutions of learning; it was not there. I sought for it in her matchless constitution and democratic congress; it was not there. Not until I went to the churches of America and found them aflame with righteousness did I understand the greatness and genius of America. America is great because America is good. When

America ceases to be good, America will cease to be great."

Faith and freedom. They belong together. There can be no freedom without faith, and since freedom is one of man's most cherished possessions, how carefully he ought to nurture that upon which so much depends!

CON SON PRISON STORY FIRST REPORTED IN JULY 1969

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

[This insertion is made jointly with the Honorable John W. Byrnes of Wisconsin.]

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a detailed news report of the prison conditions at Con Son Island in Vietnam appeared in the Appleton, Wis., Post-Crescent a year ago, on July 27, 1969.

The fact that this disturbing report was overlooked by other news media may be understandable when it is noted that the story appeared the week when Americans were preoccupied with the historic event of Eagle's landing on the moon.

The report, by Mark Oliva, has come to our attention this week. We wish to share it with our colleagues in the hope of shedding light on this unsettling situation. Mark Oliva is now a reporter for the Riverside, Calif., Press Enterprise.

The report follows:

DETENTION BASED ON SUSPICION: VIETNAM CONCENTRATION CAMP OPERATES WITH U.S. APPROVAL

(By Mark Oliva¹)

CON SON ISLAND, VIETNAM—History again is witnessing the horrors of the concentration camp, this time with a helping hand from the United States.

Con Son, the French "Devil's Island of Indochina," now is South Vietnam's barbed-wire home for more than 7,000 Vietnamese who "had to be removed" but couldn't be convicted in a trial.

Log beds, malarial mosquitoes and a host of diseases with no effective medical program, no shelter from the tropical monsoon rains and a diet not much better than silage greet the unfortunates interned in the concentration camps here.

The United States provides both financial and advisory assistance to the Con Son island prison.

On March 1, Con Son housed in excess of 9,000 prisoners. Of these, more than 7,000 were detainees. A detainee is an individual suspected of being a Viet Cong sympathizer or supporter who never has been convicted or tried.

KING OF CON SON

Vietnamese Lt. Col. Nguyen Van Ve, a brash man who illustrates his every point with a swing or sway of his swagger stick,

¹ The author of this article, Mark E. Oliva, Kaukauna, recently returned to the Post-Crescent staff after more than four years' service with the U.S. Army. He spent his last two years assigned to the Military Assistance Command-Vietnam (MACV) as an advisor to South Vietnam's General Political Warfare Department. During this time, Oliva was sent twice to Con Son Island as part of MACV psychological operations study groups.

is the commander here. He calls himself the "King of Con Son," and the title fits his power. He has total rule over the island and its prison population.

Lt. Col. Ve explains the "detainee" system simply.

He says his government needs a means to remove the potential or possible enemy from causing or contributing to trouble. When a man is suspected of giving food, shelter or information to the Viet Cong, he cannot be convicted without evidence, according to Lt. Col. Ve.

Instead, he says, these Viet Cong suspects are brought before district security committees. The committee, according to Lt. Col. Ve, does not require evidence, only grounds to believe the individual may be aiding the Viet Cong. The Committee then has the power to order the suspect sent to Con Son or one of several other detention centers for a period of six months.

Lt. Col. Ve says this dispenses with the need for a trial, conviction and evidence. He also admits that almost all of the detainees would be acquitted for lack of evidence if they were to be tried.

When questioned, Lt. Col. Ve said that he has the authority to detain these prisoners beyond the six-month period based upon his observations, and that very few actually are released after their initial six months' detention.

Our study group's tour of the prison included Camps Six and Seven, the camps that house all but 200 of the detainees.

BARBED WIRE

Each of these camps is surrounded by double fences strung heavily with barbed wire. Within, the camps are divided into many small sections, each also ringed with double fences of heavily-barbed wire. The main sections consist of two 60-foot rows of rough logs, each log five feet long, with the entire row elevated two feet off the ground. Canvas, perforated with holes is stretched about six feet overhead.

These rows of logs serve as bed, home and recreation area for the detainees. They are not allowed to leave the compound at any time. There is no shelter from malarial mosquitoes or monsoons.

At the end of each camp is a small dispensary stocked only with aspirins, salt tablets and anti-malaria pills that are ineffective against the fatal strains of malaria found on the island, according to the U.S. Army doctor accompanying our study. These dispensaries are staffed with untrained personnel.

In the side of each dispensary is a disciplinary area used for detainees found guilty of even the smallest infraction of prison rules. It, too, is encircled with a double barbed wire fence. Barbed wire also is strung the length and width of the ground, with the strands about six inches apart.

Detainees being disciplined are forced to crawl under this layer of barbed wire and lie on their backs for the duration of their sentences, often several days. They are allowed only bread and water.

We were permitted to interview individual prisoners, but Lt. Col. Ve insisted the detainees be interviewed only in the presence of a guard. Detainees interviewed refused to answer questions, apparently in fear that a "wrong" answer, after being reported by the guard, would lead to days and nights under the barbed wire.

Lt. Col. Ve stated that the detainees come from all walks of life but mainly are farmers from the provinces. He listed the three main ways in which these prisoners come before the security committees:

They are reported by a neighbor as aiding or being sympathetic to the Viet Cong.

All persons in an area are held when an Army commander in the area states someone has been aiding the Viet Cong.

When a village is being force-evacuated

and relocated prior to being destroyed to eliminate Viet Cong havens, all persons in the village who resist in any way are brought before the committees.

As with most of the other prisoners on Con Son, according to Lt. Col. Ve, the majority of the detainees continue to be held there.

Basic living conditions in the Con Son concentration camps are extremely bad, but the island's prisoners also are faced with even worse medical problems.

Malaria is the major disease. The island's mosquitoes carry two strains, one which usually is fatal and the other which the victim usually survives, but with his strength sapped. The prison dispensaries are stocked, though inadequately, with chloroquine-primaquine anti-malarial pills. These combat only the nonfatal strain. No preventative for the usually-fatal strain is available to the prisoners.

Con Son's prison population also has severe problems with beriberi and tuberculosis, as well as year-round epidemic levels of diarrhea and dysentery. Almost non-existent latrine and sewage facilities contribute to this.

All the prison dispensaries are staffed by prisoners, mostly captured Viet Cong medics. None has been trained beyond the level attained by a student nurse in the U.S..

ONE DOCTOR

The island has one doctor, a first lieutenant in the Vietnamese Regional and Popular Forces (roughly equivalent to our National Guard). However he treats only the civil servants, national police and military.

A Vietnamese public health nurse also is assigned to Con Son, mainly to treat the non-prisoner population. The nurse makes a monthly visit to each of the seven prison dispensaries.

The government provides air evacuation for members of the non-prisoner population requiring mainland treatment, but prisoners requiring such treatment must wait for the monthly supply boat.

The public health nurse admits that several prisoners have died due to lack of proper medical attention.

In addition to the detainees, Con Son also houses about 2,000 other prisoners including Viet Cong, political religious and criminal prisoners and military prisoners from the South Vietnamese forces. All these categories have been tried and convicted.

Convicted Viet Cong are considered civil prisoners and are held at Con Son. North Vietnamese prisoners of war are held at another island prison, Phu Quoc. The U.S. is not involved in the operation of Phu Quoc because the South Vietnamese government does not abide by the Geneva prisoner-of-war conventions.

With the exception of 200 detainees, the regular prisoners only are confined in Camps One through Five. Strangely, the convicted prisoners fare much better than the detainees. Camps One through Five consist of the old French prison buildings, and provide adequate though unpleasant shelter.

These prisoners leave the camps each day to go out in work parties. Although some of the prisoners still split rocks, the majority work on fishing teams or on the farms which produce most of the food other than rice which is consumed on the island. The prisoners raise mainly papaya, coconuts, pigs and chickens.

A large number of the sentenced prisoners have attained trustee status and are allowed to live outside the camps. All the prisoners except the detainees are allowed monthly three-day visits with their families, who are taken to the island on the supply boat. A beach home has been set up to house these families.

PRISONER DIET

All the prisoners, detainees included, are on the same diet. The catch of the fishing teams is laid out and salted on tin sheets

placed on the streets daily. After a day in the sun, the fish, well-dried, are fed to the prisoners. Prisoners cook the fruits, vegetables and meats raised on the island as well as rice brought in from the mainland. The cooking is done in extremely unsanitary and antiquated outdoor kitchens surviving from French days.

Many of Con Son's political prisoners were sentenced several Vietnamese regimes ago but never were released by succeeding governments, including the current Thieu government.

One prisoner interviewed on death row had been there for 13 years, sentenced for political opposition to the late President Ngo Dinh Diem in the early days of his rule.

Another death row prisoner interviewed stated he has been confined seven years for the same reason, since the latter days of Diem.

A Buddhist monk stated he has served 11 years of a 15-year political sentence, also a Diem victim still on Con Son.

A student monk said he came here three years ago on a one-year sentence, for giving sanctuary to a Viet Cong in a pagoda. He too has been forgotten.

Prisoner interviews also produced some surprising opinions. Many of the regular prisoners from rural Vietnam stated they were not too dissatisfied with their confinement because the prison living conditions were better than those they had experienced in the countryside. Other prisoners said they felt relieved to be at Con Son and away from the war.

But no prisoner was willing to say he is happy.

ELIMINATE SECRECY IN THE HOUSE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the effort to abolish secrecy in the proceedings of the House of Representatives has attracted nationwide attention—and well it might, for how we conduct the public's business can have a significant impact on the lives of the American people and the well-being of the Nation.

A sample survey of newspaper and radio-TV editorials reflects unanimous feeling that secrecy has no place in a democracy and that it should be eliminated from congressional proceedings. Many editorials, columns, and articles expressing this point of view have already been inserted in the *RECORD* over the past week. At this point, I insert in the *RECORD* some additional editorials which I recommend to my colleagues:

END SECRECY IN THE HOUSE

The U.S. House of Representatives puts its very soul on display next week.

The issue is whether the House will call a halt to some of the widespread secrecy in which it conducts the public's business. For the first time in a generation, there is a chance that some of the secrecy rules will fall.

Every single member of the House needs to be watched closely on his positions and his votes as events unfold.

Dozens of open-door measures will be debated on the floor beginning Monday. The key proposals would require that the votes of individual Congressmen be recorded by name and made public on all significant actions both in committee and on the floor.

CXVI—1528—Part 18

Another would make it much more difficult to close committee hearings to the public. Another would permit the televising of hearings, as the Senate already does.

These reforms and others like them obviously make good sense, but they won't come easily next week. The truth is that a great many House members value and exploit secrecy, which allows them to maneuver and manipulate and make lavish promises back home without the necessity of going on the record in the House itself.

A WTOP check with Maryland Congressmen Hogan and Gude turned up enthusiastic promises of support for the anti-secrecy proposals. Virginia Congressmen Scott and Broyhill were non-committal.

Clear-cut choices are involved between government in the shadows and government in the sunshine. As various people have noted, Congress, as an institution, is on trial.

The House must not muff this chance to open its business to public view.

This was a WTOP Editorial . . . Norman Davis speaking for WTOP.

[From the Washington Post, July 10, 1970]

STRIKING AT SECRECY IN THE HOUSE

The House will have an opportunity next week to transform itself into a democratic legislative body. It falls short of that category now because of the secrecy in its hearings deliberations, the denial of adequate information to its members and the avoidance of record votes on many vital issues. A stranger or even a curious citizen viewing its operations today might well conclude that one of its chief preoccupations is to prevent the people from knowing what it does, and why, and where its members stand on anything that counts.

As reported out by the Rules Committee, the congressional reorganization bill was a rather humdrum affair. But Majority Leader Carl Albert and various other influential members are lending their support to an amendment that would make it possible to identify congressmen when they vote. Under the present system of debating highly controversial bills in the Committee of the Whole, members pass on amendments of great importance without a record vote. The arrangement is tailor-made for the protection of special interests against the public interest and for denial to the people of the information they need to pass judgment on their congressmen at the polls. Responsible government is under a serious handicap.

David S. Broder noted in his column on this page yesterday that this reform, if adopted, may bring some profound changes in the nature of the House. It would doubtless compel members to spend more time on the floor considering legislation and less time running errands for constituents. Under the present setup fewer than one third of all House members participate in non-record votes. With this proposed reform in effect important legislative decisions should be made by a visible majority instead of a small group wielding the powers of the House under the cloak of secrecy.

The impact of the public on the outcome should be greater because Members who have to stand behind their votes are more inclined to give heed to what their constituents are thinking.

The Democratic Study Group in the House sees the recording of votes on legislative amendments as "the single most important reform which could be made in House procedures—more important in fact than abolishing the seniority system," which is saying a good deal. If the House is really in a reforming mood, however, it ought to go further than requiring record votes on the floor. Leading reformers are also demanding open committee sessions, the disclosure of committee and subcommittee votes on every roll

call and the delivery of all committee reports to every member well in advance of record votes on the floor.

How can the House pretend to be a democratic body when it permits its powerful Appropriations Committee to hold all of its more than 300 annual hearings and meetings behind closed doors? Such vital committees as Ways and Means, Armed Services and Foreign Affairs are also heavily addicted to the same practice, and nearly half of all the sessions by all House committees are cloaked in secrecy. Only the Education and Labor Committee functions as if it had nothing to hide.

With new leadership emerging in the House, there is a rare opportunity to make that body more responsive to the popular will. The restoration of faith in our institutions requires that they operate as they were intended to operate—in the light of day. It will be interesting to see how each legislator responds to this challenge. But, unfortunately, the question of whether record votes will be permitted on legislative amendments in the future will be decided, under the present procedure, by a non-record vote.

[From the Washington Daily News, July 13, 1970]

OPENING UP THE HOUSE

Members of the U.S. House of Representatives this week will be offered the opportunity to render service to our Republic by voting to end the secrecy in which they cloak a good deal of the nation's business.

Reports from Capitol Hill indicate substantial bipartisan support for such reform legislation on grounds it would help restore public confidence in the Congress.

It would indeed. As matters stand today major bills can be killed behind the closed doors of a House committee with no public record of who voted pro or con, except as it is "leaked" to reporters. One amendment to the proposed reorganization bill would attach names to the "ayes" and "nays."

And when bills reach the House floor, members often can avoid identification with the position they took on politically risky issues thru the "teller" vote—a head count that does not identify by name the heads counted. The reorganization bill would require that a name be attached to every head.

Secret tactics over the short haul are, no doubt, to the individual Congressman's immediate political advantage. But over the longer term they erode public faith in the House as an institution where a man's principles can be measured against his voting record.

If our Republic is to persevere, our Representatives must be known for each and every stand they take and submit the complete record of their performance to a fully informed electorate.

That's what the upcoming vote on the House reorganization bill is all about. And that's why the House should adopt it. Overwhelmingly.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 13, 1970]

ON THE RECORD

One of the cherished traditions of the House of Representatives is the secrecy that cloaks many of that body's most important operations. Approximately half the committee hearings and meetings are closed to the press and the public. Committee votes are closed to the press and the public. Committee votes are, for the most part, never made public. Committee reports are customarily kept from the view of everyone—including members of Congress—until hours before a floor vote. And votes on vital amendments are hidden from the prying eyes of newsmen and constituents by the parliamentary maneuver of the non-record vote.

Observers of Congress and handfals of

Idealistic congressmen have long viewed this passion for secrecy as an odd manifestation of democracy in action. And now, as the Legislative Reorganization bill heads for the floor of Congress, there are strong indications that at least a part of the veil will be lifted.

The bill—the first congressional reorganization measure in 24 years—provides that most committee hearings will be open and that some will be televised. Some 50 planned amendments will, for the most part, attempt to open more of the operations of the House to public inspection. The secret vote has drawn the particular attention of the reformers.

The Democratic Study Group, a collection of some 100 House liberals, has launched an all-out attack on the practice of non-record voting. They have, somewhat surprisingly, picked up significant support from the conservative outposts of both parties.

There is no real question as to why the secret vote originated and why it has been continued to this day. The purpose is to keep the voters back home from knowing for certain how their man in Congress voted on a particular bill.

That is, to be sure, not the reason usually cited by the defenders of congressional secrecy. They argue that roll-call votes take too much time. Or they claim that keeping constituents in the dark permits a representative to vote according to the dictates of his conscience rather than the dictates of political expedience. Some defenders, in desperation, have been known to cite the historical precedent of the British Parliament and the Continental Congress.

Taking these one at a time:

The reform-pushers point out that the time-consuming roll call is not the only alternative to secrecy. A teller vote, which is one of the methods now favored by the secrecy lobby, could be employed. The only change required would be the recording—and the publication—of the individual votes, instead of the counting of numbers of ayes and nays and letting it go at that. Or, should the House decide to enter the 20th Century completely, electronic voting devices could be installed that would provide a record vote in a matter of seconds.

As for the contention that consciences are freer if the voters are kept in the dark, it is necessary only to note that a representative's first duty is to represent the collective conscience and the will of his district.

Finally, the historical argument falls apart with the realization that the secrecy of Parliament and the Continental Congress arose out of a wholesome respect for the wrath of the King of England.

Today, the Congress of the United States has scant cause to fear the wrath of the British monarch. As for the M.P.s, they decided 138 years ago that there wasn't too much a threat from the throne, and they dropped the unrecorded teller vote from their rules of order.

It's time for the House to go fully on the record, too.

[From the Hartford Courant, July 12, 1970]
LEGISLATIVE REFORM NEEDS PUBLIC SUPPORT

A bipartisan group of Congressmen, including both liberals and conservatives, are now joined in an effort to remove unnecessary secrecy in the legislative process.

In specific, they propose to offer a series of amendments to a Congressional reform bill that is scheduled for House action beginning next week. The most important of these amendments, they say, is a measure that would put House members on record on significant issues coming before that chamber. At present these issues are generally decided by a simple counting of the members, with no names recorded before or against. The proponents of the amendments want it recorded how House members vote on major

issues both in committees and on the House floor. They want committee hearings and meetings open to the public and the press, and committee reports to be available before final House action on legislation.

It could be argued, of course, that the teller vote method is not exactly secret. Individual members can be identified and their votes observed under this process, though no overall record is made.

Nevertheless, proponents of the new legislation are certainly correct in principle. There must be no more secrecy in the legislative process than necessary, however one argues the definition of "necessary." As the group says, secrecy, or obfuscation of any kind, undermines the democratic process and saps the public confidence in Congress as a responsible and effective legislative body. It is not alone that "secrecy is a comfortable thing," as one House member wryly put it. It's that the public in a democracy must be informed, there must be a free flow of information, or else the democratic process has small chance of functioning. More concisely, the members of Congress are intended to be the people's instruments for shaping the nation, and the people have a right to know how their representatives are discharging the trust and responsibility placed in them.

This is not to say one way or another that Congress is or isn't leveling with the public as it goes about its work. It would be equally undemocratic to make insinuations. But just on principle secrecy is to be avoided, and to have this written into the ground-rules is as urgent as it is desirable. It is a form of public protection and public enlightenment. Reform of rules and procedures is not just a matter of Congressional internal "housekeeping," but of public concern. It will be of great help to the citizen himself if he gets behind such reform when the House considers legislative reorganization next week.

[From the New York Post, July 10, 1970]

ENDING SECRECY IN THE HOUSE

The House yesterday inadvertently obliged a new coalition of Congressional reformers with a clear demonstration of the need for Congressional reform. Denying members an opportunity for debate and withholding advance word that the matter was scheduled, the leaders succeeded in forcing a precipitate vote on the first House test of the Senate's Cooper-Church amendment; opponents of the amendment won.

The sorry episode followed by a day an announcement that a bipartisan group plans next week to push for major alterations in current House procedures. Among their suggested reforms are advanced scheduling of votes and guarantees of ample debating time before the balloting. Had those provisions been policy, yesterday's demeaning spectacle would have been avoided—and the result perhaps different.

The recommendations, to be considered by the House next week, are primarily aimed at combating the secrecy which now shrouds so many important Congressional functions, particularly in the area of appropriations.

One key proposal would direct the House, at the request of one fifth of a quorum, to maintain an official record of how members voted in teller votes. Under current practice, a teller vote is taken by having the lawmakers pass down the center aisle and be counted for or against. Each member's decision is not officially recorded, permitting him the luxury of keeping his stand on a sensitive issue from becoming publicly known. This provision will itself be voted on in an unrecorded teller vote next week. We hope it will be the last.

THE RIGHT TO KNOW WHERE YOUR CONGRESSMAN STANDS

Public business should be conducted in the open, with public officials fully accountable to the people for their decisions.

This is not always the case in the U.S. House of Representatives, where votes are often taken on important issues—the Cambodian operation, for example, or the 18-year-old vote—with no record of individual positions.

Votes are recorded by name in the House on final passage of bills and on motions to return them to committee. There is not always a record vote, however, when the House votes on amendments to bills—amendments which can alter and even reverse the original purpose of proposed legislation.

The House considers amendments under an ancient committee-of-the-whole procedure with no roll calls and, at most, a teller vote where members are counted, but not recorded, as they file down an aisle. Roll calls can be forced on successful amendments, but not on those that fail.

Fifty-seven Congressmen—Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives—hope to end the practice of secret voting by amending a legislative reorganization bill scheduled for House debate in the near future. Their proposal would retain the teller vote, but provide that it be recorded by name if 20 percent of the members present demand it.

TV2 believes the American people are entitled to know exactly where their Congressmen stand when important votes are taken. We hope the U.S. House of Representatives will adopt proposed changes in the rules to make it more difficult for its members to conceal their voting records in a cloak of anonymity.

[From the Charleston Gazette, June 8, 1970]
WILL OUR REPRESENTATIVES STAND UP AND BE COUNTED?

From the public interest standpoint, nothing is of greater importance in the current session of Congress than the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, which is scheduled for consideration in the House of Representatives in mid-July. This will provide the first opportunity in more than two decades to make major changes in House rules and procedures.

What makes this legislation so vital is that it opens the way for ending secrecy in the legislative process, an element that keeps members of Congress as well as the public in the dark on legislation affecting everyone, and serves at the same time to block desirable legislation and to aid special interests whose purposes cannot stand public scrutiny.

For example, the House Appropriations Committee, which deals in billions of taxpayers' dollars, holds all of its more than 300 annual meetings and hearings behind closed doors. Moreover, reports of this committee—of which Rep. John M. Slack of Charleston is a member—generally are unavailable until just before the multibillion dollar measures are approved by the House.

Under such procedure, the people and most members of Congress are unaware of what's going on until after it has been done—and this is hardly conducive to sound legislation in the public interest.

So important is the issue that the Democratic Study Group (DSG), headed by Rep. Donald M. Fraser of Minnesota, is making a major bipartisan effort to abolish secrecy in the House. The DSG has prepared a special report on secrecy which the Gazette is reprinting in a three-part series on the opposite page, starting today, in the hope that people will inform themselves on the seriousness of the situation and make their wishes known to their representatives.

The DSG sums up the problem of secrecy in these words:

"Secrecy pervades the legislative process in the House of Representatives. Arbitrary and undemocratic procedures are so much the rule that they are hardly noticed let alone

seriously challenged. Yet secrecy has a more debilitating impact on the House than its well-publicized companion, the seniority system.

"Secrecy in the House is corrosive. It undermines the democratic process by denying members information they need to make intelligent legislative decisions and by denying voters information they need to make informed electoral decisions."

"It destroys public confidence in the House as a responsive legislative body. It makes the House incomprehensible to the average citizen and contributes to the growing distrust of elected officials."

In pursuing its objectives, the DSG will push for a number of strengthening amendments, concentrating primarily on ending the practice of making secret or non-record votes on major national issues.

* * * members have had an opportunity to analyze it, and to provide for record votes.

Ironically, under present procedures, these important questions will be decided by non-record votes—meaning that members who want to keep their secret play-houses can hide behind the system that is so destructive to the Democratic process.

The people, however, are entitled to know the position of their representatives. We particularly challenge West Virginia's representatives to make their votes public. How about it, Mr. Slack? How about it, Mr. Molohan, Mr. Staggers, Mr. Hechler, and Mr. Kee? Will you stand up and be counted—or will you invoke secrecy to protect secrecy?

[From the Pittsburgh Press, July 13, 1970]

OPENING UP THE HOUSE

Members of the U.S. House of Representatives this week will be offered the opportunity to render service to our republic by voting to end the secrecy in which they cloak a good deal of the nation's business.

Reports from Capitol Hill indicate substantial bipartisan support for such reform legislation on grounds it would help restore public confidence in the Congress.

It would indeed. As matters stand today major bills can be killed behind the closed doors of a House committee with no public record of who voted pro or con, except as it is "leaked" to reporters.

One amendment to the proposed reorganization bill would attach names to the "ayes" and "nays."

And when bills reach the House floor, members often can avoid identification with the position they took on politically risky issues through the "teller" vote—a head count that does not identify by name the heads counted.

The reorganization bill would require that a name be attached to every head.

Secret tactics over the short haul are, no doubt, to the individual congressman's immediate political advantage.

Over the longer term they erode public faith in the House as an institution where a man's principles can be measured against his voting record.

If our republic is to persevere, our representatives must be known for each and every stand they take and submit the complete record of their performance to a fully informed electorate.

That's what the upcoming vote on the House reorganization bill is all about.

And that's why the House should adopt it. Overwhelmingly.

[From the Des Moines Register, June 21, 1970]

SECRET CONGRESSIONAL VOTING

Members of the House of Representatives too often hide their votes on important issues. The secret voting was inherited from British parliamentary procedure where it once served to protect members from the

wrath of the king. Parliament got over being afraid of the king in 1832, but Congress appears to be still afraid of someone.

The Constitution requires a recorded vote on any issue when one-fifth of the members so request, but this provision often is evaded by taking the decisive action as a committee of the whole, or by making the record vote the vote on formal passage after the issue actually has been decided on an earlier, and often quite different, non-recorded vote on a procedural question.

A bipartisan group of 45 congressmen is working for an amendment to the pending congressional reorganization act to make roll-call votes possible on any issue. The House may not accept the amendment—and, ironically, the voters may not be able to find out how their representatives voted on it.

The reluctance of House members to stand up and be counted by name is usually explained as a practical necessity. A roll-call takes about 30 minutes, compared to 10 minutes for the much more usual teller vote in which members march past one of two clerks to be counted (as bodies, not by name) for or against. One of the proposed reforms would have the clerks write down names as members filed past.

A number of state legislatures (including Iowa's) for years have used electronic voting scoreboards on which a roll-call vote can be taken and recorded in a couple of minutes. There is no reason why the House could not do the same.

If city council members are required to cast recorded votes on such minor question as curb-and-gutter projects, is it reasonable that members of Congress, deciding issues of national importance, cast their votes anonymously under the shield of a parliamentary gimmick?

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION QUESTIONED ON SATURATED FATS

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on June 25, 1969, I wrote the following letter to the Honorable Herbert L. Ley, Jr., Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, asking why manufacturers of food products were not required to show the amount of saturated fats in their products.

The letter follows:

JUNE 25, 1969.

HON. HERBERT L. LEY, JR.,
Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration,
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: I am enclosing a copy of Rodale's Health Bulletin for June 7, 1969. As one who has a high cholesterol count, I look for fat free foods and substitutes, and I must say that the statements contained in this health bulletin relative to cream substitutes are amazing and shocking.

Can you tell me why manufacturers of these products and of all products are not required to show the amount of saturated fat their product contains?

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

WHAT THEY DO NOT SAY

It's what those ads touting low-calorie substitutes don't say that's significant. Many nondairy creams have higher percentages of possibly harmful saturated fats than the real

thing, but that information is strangely absent from their promotional materials.

However, a Harvard School of Public Health investigator concerned about the use of those products among patients who want to avoid saturated fats "for health reasons" has questioned their desirability. Elaine R. Monsen, Ph.D., found ersatz creams have 20 percent more saturated fatty acids than natural cream. Saturated fatty acids raise the cholesterol level of the blood, and many authorities believe that high cholesterol levels are directly related to heart disease.

In addition, Dr. Monsen, who presented her findings in the *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, found that the products are "made primarily from coconut oil. They represent themselves as vegetable oil products, but coconut oil is a saturated vegetable oil—not typical of the vegetable oils." Other vegetable oils, such as corn, safflower and peanut oils, have polyunsaturated fats, which do not raise cholesterol levels, she said.

Another researcher, working independently of Dr. Monsen, confirmed that the products are mostly coconut oil. Dr. Ancel Keys, of the University of Minnesota, said, "Coconut oil is the worst oil that they could have chosen." The only advantage it has is commercial—it doesn't spoil rapidly. Keys said he would prefer "the real thing" to any of the 14 products studied by Dr. Monsen, although he objects "to overindulgence in butterfat."

Monsen's samples, which were picked up in retail outlets, ranged in fat content from about 10 percent for Coffee-Rich to about 55 percent for D'Zerta Low Calorie Whipped Topping. In all the products but Reddi Whip saturated fatty acids were at least 94 percent of the total fat content—26 percent of the product's bulk. Milk contains just over 3 percent milk fat, half and half creams have about 10 or 12 percent fat, and other creams contain from 10 to 38 percent milk fat. Keys said his research indicated coconut oil was "two times as bad as butter oil on the cholesterol level of the blood." Safflower oil, he said, had one-tenth of the effect of cream.

The two researchers were concerned because, in Dr. Monsen's words, "A wide interest in these products is seen among people who wish to restrict or control their dietary fats, e.g., to decrease saturated fat consumption."

The following chart of the 14 brands of substitute creams studied by Dr. Monsen shows the percentage of the total fat content composed of saturated fatty acids.

[Product]

Total saturated fats in percentage

(1) Unsweetened: (a) Dry powders:	
Coffee-mate	98.1
Cremora	98.6
N-Rich	95.7
Pream	98.0
(b) Liquid: Coffee-rich	98.2
(2) Soured: (a) Semi-solid:	
IMO	96.4
Zevro	96.7
(3) Sweetened: (a) Dry powders:	
Dream Whip	98.2
Lucky Whip	94.8
(b) Semi-solid: Cool Whip	98.9
(c) Whipped; aerosol can:	
Ditto	99.3
Reddi Whip	74.5
Rich's whip topping	95.5
(d) Artificially sweetened (dry powder): D'Zerta low calorie whipped topping	
	98.6

In correspondence over the year, I finally simplified my question by asking why food which used coconut oil should not state on their labels that coconut oil is being used rather than permitting it to be designated as a vegetable oil.

After a year I still have no answer. I am in receipt of the following letter

signed by the Director of the Office of Legislative Services saying in substance that FDA is still looking into the matter:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,
Rockville, Md., July 9, 1970.

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. YATES: This is in reply to your letters of April 22, 1970, and June 22, 1970, concerning the labeling of products with information about the type of fat they contain.

As we stated in our letter to you of January 15, 1970, we believe there is authority under section 403 (1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require manufacturers to declare the specific types of fats and oils in a given food. We also mentioned that there was a policy adopted in 1940 by the Food and Drug Administration which permitted the food industry to declare individual fats and oils as "shortening," "vegetable oil," or "hardened (or hydrogenated) vegetable oil" and that that policy was being reevaluated.

Closely aligned with that issue is the matter of labeling of oils, fats, and fatty foods used for regulating the intake of fatty acids in dietary management with respect to disease. While we had promised to keep you advised of developments, we have delayed writing you in the belief that a formal policy regarding these issues would have been formulated by this time. We are still not in a position to announce a formal policy. However, this is not an indication that we are not working on the matter. Just recently principal members of our staff met with a representative of the National Heart and Lung Institute and on another occasion with representatives from the Federal Trade Commission to discuss the problems. We do expect that a statement of policy will issue shortly and will keep you advised.

If we can be of further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

M. J. RYAN,
Director, Office of Legislative Services.

I have dispatched the following letter to Dr. Charles C. Edwards, Commissioner of Food and Drug Administration, asking the very simple question: Why cannot the label of foods which contain coconut oil be so labeled?

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1970.

DR. CHARLES C. EDWARDS,
Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration,
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare, Public Health Service,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. EDWARDS: Receipt is acknowledged of the letter of July 9 signed by M. J. Ryan, Director of the Office of Legislative Services, which is in reply to my letters of April 22 and June 22. I specifically asked the question as to why coconut oil could not be labeled as coconut oil rather than as vegetable oil and that the matter was of importance to people who are on an anti-cholesterol diet.

Looking at my file, I note that I first wrote on the subject a year ago on June 25 when I asked the same question. A year has gone by and still there is no answer to the question. I wish someone in your office would tell me why if coconut oil is used in a food, it should not be labeled as coconut oil.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

QUINCY-SOUTH SHORE, MASS.,
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PAYS
TRIBUTE TO SPEAKER MCCORMACK

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. I have been given the pleasure and privilege to bring to the attention of the Members, the unanimously voted resolution of the Quincy-South Shore Chamber of Commerce in tribute to a great legislator and leader, our beloved Speaker, JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Never have I known a leader so responsive to the needs of people. One who is always patient and courteous and who never fails to give serious consideration to their problems.

Too often men achieve outstanding success as lawyers, engineers, doctors, bankers, politicians, merchants, and in all other fields of endeavor, but have no heritage worthy of being lovingly remembered. Surely JOHN W. MCCORMACK's good heartedness, extraordinary devotion to his country, service with compassion, initiative, and individual endeavor has prompted the realization that when the record of the history of this great Nation is written the name JOHN W. MCCORMACK will rank among the greatest men in our Nation's history.

Through the request of Mr. William A. O'Connell, executive vice-president of Quincy-South Shore Chamber of Commerce and its members, I submit the following:

A TRIBUTE OF REGARD AND SINCERE APPRECIATION

The Quincy-South Shore Chamber of Commerce at a meeting of its Board of Directors, held on May 27, 1970, unanimously voted to record this tribute to the Honorable John W. McCormack, Member of Congress and Speaker of the House of Representatives. His recent announcement that he will voluntarily retire following forty-two years of dedicated public service culminates a most distinguished record in the nation's capital representing the Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts.

Speaker McCormack's outstanding leadership, his understanding of human nature, and his helpful interest in governmental programs have not only reflected an intense desire to faithfully represent those in his particular district but his fellow citizens throughout the entire Commonwealth as well.

In matters of importance within the area served by the Quincy-South Shore Chamber of Commerce his wise counsel and co-operative efforts have been most beneficial. His personal interest in the growth and progress of the shipbuilding industry, the development of harbors and waterways, as well as other federally financed projects, have been of great benefit to the entire community. He has been most generous in giving of his time and effort in the nation's capital whenever called upon, either as Speaker of the House of Representatives or as a co-operating Member of Congress with the Massachusetts Delegation.

Through this tribute of sincere appreciation, the Quincy-South Shore Chamber of

Commerce, therefore, cites a native son of Massachusetts, Speaker John W. McCormack of Boston, for his outstanding leadership and co-operative efforts in governmental service. It is the wish of the entire Board of Directors that in his retirement he may be blessed with good health and happiness for many years to come.

TACOMA NEWS TRIBUNE DISCUSSES "SEEDS OF ANARCHY" IN ROCK FESTIVAL

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

On the Fourth of July weekend 10,000 people converged on the small mountain town of Eatonville in Washington State for a "rock festival."

This is nothing new in our country. What is different about this one is that the law enforcement authorities of Pierce County, where Eatonville is located, had taken steps to prevent the festival and had obtained a superior court order forbidding the festival.

Thus the festival was not merely in defiance of custom and convention, as have been previous ones. This one was specifically and deliberately—and insistently—in defiance of the law.

Law enforcement officers were unable to prevent the horde of people from going to the festival grounds. So, with commendable and probably uncommon good judgment, they devoted their efforts instead to containing the festival. This policy brought about no confrontations, but it did result in the arrest of 58 individuals on various charges, mostly for alleged narcotics violations.

This situation has understandably caused considerable concern throughout our area, Mr. Speaker. I believe this was best expressed in an editorial in the Tacoma News Tribune on July 11. The problem and at least one approach to its solution, are outlined in the editorial: Federal legislation as suggested here might indeed be helpful when people cross State lines to attend such festivals. I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

EDITORIAL

SEEDS OF ANARCHY

Only two good things can be said about the Fourth of July weekend rock festival held at Eatonville: (1) a potentially explosive situation was defused by the intelligent policy of Sheriff Carl Petersen and (2) those who violated the law and court order banning the event will be brought to justice.

Sheriff Petersen must be commended for deciding to contain rather than stop the festival by force. When a mob takes over control of events, past experience elsewhere has shown that nightsticks, gas and guns only aggravate the situation. Inevitably, the violence that follows ends in tragedy.

Thanks to the experience and wise judgment of Sheriff Petersen, what might have

developed into a riotous confrontation resulting in a possible bloodbath was avoided. Instead of clubs at the scene, those who flouted the court order, and the law respecting narcotics and behavior, will face their fate before the bar of justice. Whether and what they did wrong will be decided by the courts and the penalties invoked will be according to law.

After what happened at Eatonville, and the year before at Tenino, it is patently clear that society must find a way to cope with the phenomena of rock festivals. Prosecutor Ron Hendry feels, in view of the outright challenge to law and order these festivals present, the answer may lie in federal law. Pointing to the seriousness of this matter, Hendry said:

"There is no doubt in my mind that events such as the one at Eatonville, the riots on campus, the violence in the streets and the growing philosophy of anarchy is bringing our entire system of law and order and justice to a 'high noon'," he said.

Rock festivals like this are shocking spectacles. They are characterized by unrestrained use of drugs and alcohol, nudity and sex and behavior that is totally lacking in taste and discipline. The tragedy is that young children are exposed to drug-induced activities that border on the psychotic.

Not only were there a sizable number of small children present, many were subjected to neglect and exposed to health and sanitation hazards which were so flagrant that the parents, were it possible for the sheriff's deputies to do so, could have been arrested and charged with felonies.

It is most difficult to understand how parents could permit children under the age of 14 to use narcotics, or allowed behavior that results in venereal disease. Hendry reported one baby suffered second-degree sunburn.

Hendry put his finger on the nub of the problem when, commenting on the broader implications of these mob events, he observed:

"This is the first rock festival held in which there was a binding court order prohibiting it. Yet, because of a system of mob rule, the event took place, contributing to a breakdown of law and order.

"This could lead to total anarchy. In fact, I think the seeds of anarchy were sown here."

DR. HOMER S. SWINGLE: LEADERSHIP IN FISH CULTURE

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, a very important work is taking place at Auburn University in the newly created Department of Fisheries and Allied Aquacultures. This new department, under the able leadership of Dr. Homer S. Swingle, will be responsible for developing the entire program of fish culture under a new 5 year, \$800,000 grant recently made from aid to establish an International Center for Aquaculture at Auburn University.

As a former student of Auburn University and as a member of the present board of trustees of that university, we are extremely proud of the accomplishments made under Dr. Swingle's leadership in fish culture during the past 35 years. I would wish to call the attention of my colleague's recent article appearing

in the Selma Times-Journal, outlining this important work.

40-YEAR FISHING TRIP FEEDING HUNGRY WORLD (By J. D. Harwood)

Not many fishermen start on a fishing trip in the morning and end up trying to feed millions of hungry people around the world. But Dr. Homer S. Swingle did exactly that.

In the early morning of his career at Auburn University, Dr. Swingle started searching for a good fishing spot. Now, much later in the day, he is internationally known, is head of the newly created Department of Fisheries and Allied Aquacultures, Auburn University School of Agriculture and Agricultural Experiment Station and is director of the new International Center for Aquaculture.

Dr. Swingle came to Auburn as an entomologist who liked to fish. Mill pond fishing was very popular in his native Ohio, but good pond fishing in the South was almost nonexistent. There weren't many ponds in Alabama and no one knew how to manage those that were here. Dr. Swingle decided to do what he could to correct that situation. He unknowingly launched a new career and set in motion a program that now girdles the globe.

An early innovation of Dr. Swingle's proved to be the key that unlocked the door to huge successes in fisheries research. He was familiar with the value and efficiency of the small plot technique used by agricultural researchers. He reasoned that if small soil plots would work for crop research, small water plots—small ponds—would work just as effectively for fisheries research. Time has proved the soundness of his reasoning.

"Small plots" used in Auburn fisheries research now include 210 earthen ponds, 100 concrete ponds, and 300 plastic ponds. Facilities also include modern laboratories, hatcheries, holding buildings and service buildings.

Early research at Auburn was directed toward successfully managing farm ponds for water storage for irrigation, for fish production, and for livestock. Dr. Swingle still wanted a place to fish, but he did not overlook the importance of the farm pond to the total farm enterprise.

Interest in water conservation stemmed from the fact that low soil fertility in the South was the result of high temperatures and heavy rainfall. Runoff, both surface and underground, carried away large amounts of plant nutrients—as much as 50 per cent by some estimates. Stopping this runoff would automatically stop much of this nutrient loss. Holding the water was not the primary objective of the research, however. The water had to be used, profitably if possible, after it was impounded. So research into dam construction, watershed management, kinds of fish for stocking pond management for sport fishing, aquatic weed control, and commercial fish production was started.

Results obtained in this research have been widely used by farmers, state and federal hatcherymen, fisherymen, sportsmen, fisheries biologists, conservationists, and many others both in the United States and in foreign countries. This research showed that impounded water can be managed, just as farm land is managed, and people around the world were quick to take advantage of this discovery.

The Auburn station was the first to develop a program of commercial minnow production and commercial fish production. Methods of managing public fishing lakes were devised at Auburn—methods that proved so successful that they are now being used in whole or in part by many state departments of conservation.

Just as did the proverbial rings from the stone tossed into the water, interest in the fisheries research at Auburn spread in ever widening circles. One of these rings reached

the Rockefeller Foundation, and that organization awarded a \$500,000 grant to Alabama for research on fish production in impounded waters: to improve existing ponds and construct 100 new ponds, to hire new professional and technical staff members, and for expenses of actual research. With an eye to the undernourished and starving in many areas of the world, the Rockefeller Foundation supplied the funds for Auburn University to expand research efforts on food fish production.

The fishing trip had turned into an exploration of unfished waters, and Dr. Swingle, like any true fisherman, was delighted at the prospect.

Dr. Swingle and other members of the fisheries staff have conducted research projects in far corners of the world and have served on many national committees.

During the years the Auburn research program was developing the staff was also building an equally famous teaching program for bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees in fisheries. Non-degree-granting instruction programs were also developed so that professional fisheries biologists from around the world could come to Auburn and take advantage of knowledge gained through research.

As early as 1941 informal courses were available. Formal courses leading to degrees were first offered in 1947. Since that time many students have come through the program. Through 1969, 55 foreign students representing 17 countries had received degrees from Auburn in these fields. Many more, from more countries, had participated in the non-degree-granting program. This does not take into account the students from the United States who are now working throughout the world.

The program has attracted grants from the Rockefeller Foundation, fish and game divisions of Southeastern states, U.S. Public Health Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Alabama Department of Conservation, Water Resources Research Institute (Auburn), the U.S. Department of the Interior, the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development. These institutional grants are awarded "to research and educational institutions in the United States for the purpose of strengthening their capability to develop and carry out programs concerned with the economic and social development of less developed countries."

Evidence of the success of these projects is the recent award of a five-year, \$800,000 grant from AID to establish an International Center for Aquaculture here.

The impact of this program will be felt for years to come, it is hoped that many children yet unborn will avoid starvation because many years ago a man in Alabama wanted to go fishing.

If only all fishing trips were that successful.

THE KILLERS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, an informative article, "The Killers!" appeared in the July 1970 issue of Naval Aviation News. The article concerns itself with the Navy's efforts to institute a mandatory drug education program for preventing and eliminating drug abuse among its personnel. I am sure my colleagues in the House realize the severe problems of drug abuse today, and I hope

they find the following story enlightening and thought-provoking.

THE KILLERS!

(By PH1 Robert E. Woods)

I don't really know how to go about writing this letter, but I said I would so I will hope it is done right. I first started smoking weed with a girl who was four years older than me. The first time I smoked it was really far out. I went home stoned on it and no one knew anything and at the time that was great for me. A few weeks went by and one of my good friends was just getting stared by one of his bigger brothers and in no time we were getting it by the pounds and selling it by the lids. Beside we could smoke as much as we could, after a while we were smoking 3 times a day every day. Then all of a sudden weed when dry and it wasn't as cheap as it used to be. When we raised our price on it no one could afford to buy it and we went out of business and that was quite a blow on us and we started robbing women's hand bags to get the money for weed.

Some people say that weed doesn't hook people. Bull! After a while you get hooked in your mind like I mean I used to live until the next day only to smoke more weed. After a while my mother found out I used the stuff and I started using valium in my eyes and the took out all the redness. And I was able to tell her I quit.

Then one day she found a lid in my pillow and I told her it was a fake to get off the hook. That night I ran away and went to big sir and spent the night. The next day I went to San D. on my way to Mexico. When I was hitchhiking I got to thinking that I was going to be a nobody if I don't go to high school and there ain't no way so I called home and stared on my way when I meet you.

(The above letter, received by a San Diego, Calif., school teacher, was written by a 14-year-old marijuana user. The teacher put the boy on an airplane for his home in San Francisco. The letter appears as it was written.)

The average drug user in the Navy is on his first enlistment, usually nonrated, unmarried, a high school dropout and 20 years old. However, the age group ranges between 18 and 23. Some of the brighter ones had three to nine months of college before they dropped out. Further, they are almost invariably service school dropouts. Sixty percent of Navy drug users began using drugs prior to enlistment and are, therefore, fraudulent enlistees, having concealed the fact upon enlistment. The Navy has recognized the problem. The Secretary of the Navy has directed (SecNav Directive 6710.1A) commanding officers to institute a mandatory drug education program for preventing and eliminating drug abuse within their commands and to report the results to the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations by letter. Additionally, Chaplains have established workshops to deal with the problem.

In 1963, 30 men were discharged for drug abuse. The figures for subsequent years have continued to rise. Last year, 3,808 men were discharged for illegal drug use.

Drug abuse is a tragic and growing problem. We can think of nothing more potentially dangerous than a man on drugs working around airplanes. *NANews'* purpose in preventing these articles is twofold. We are concerned about the young man who may be contemplating drug experimentation. We urge him not to. And we are concerned about what could happen on a flight deck, flight line or in an aircraft where a drug user might be working. It is a chilling thought.

If we can reach one individual and stop him from drug experimentation, then it will have been worthwhile.

If you don't know how to smoke 'pot,' shoot 'speed,' or 'smash' or 'smack,' and if you don't know how to pop pills, I'm going to show you," EMC Donald F. Methlie told a group of Navy enlisted men. "I'm going to show you what it looks like, how much to pay for it, and where to get it. I want you to be informed."

Chief Methlie is not a drug pusher. He's a member of Cruiser-Destroyer Force, Pacific Fleet investigation team. Among his duties is the job of educating Navy personnel on the effects of drugs. The presentation is called, simply, *Drug Awareness*.

"We want to make the men aware of the narcotics problem. It's like sex: everybody knows about, but no one wants to talk about it," he said.

Society is experiencing a crisis with young people and the drug problem. The CruDesPac team is attempting to tell Navy men—the young 18-23-year-old non-rated, single men—how narcotics affect people.

"This problem doesn't have any social, economic, geographic or ethnic boundaries. It affects the rich as well as the poor; the Negro as well as the Caucasian," Methlie says.

In his presentation, Methlie holds a captive audience. His voice is strong, often to the yelling point, and the audience can't do anything but pay attention. Chief Methlie becomes very angry over drugs. He has seen what happens to young people who experiment with them. Periodically, he and other members of the team visit the Los Angeles Police Department Narcotics Division.

Methlie emphasizes he does not deal in fiction or philosophy, only facts.

"In 1967, the Naval Investigative Service Office (NIS) investigated 3,949 individuals for illegal drug use. In 1968, NIS investigated 7,771 men for drug abuse—a 98 percent increase over 1967. In the first eight months of 1969, we investigated 7,741 drug cases. We had another 100 percent increase last year," he said.

Marijuana, the most popular drug for beginners, can be both a depressant and a stimulant. Methlie calls it a "mood" narcotic.

"It depends on what mood the person is in when he uses it. If the user is happy, he becomes happier, and frequently forgets normal caution. If he is depressed, he will become more depressed, even to the point of suicide. An angry person will become angrier."

"A marijuana user normally is a gregarious individual; he likes company. A real user would 'blow grass' with his head in a plastic bag—if he could do it and still breathe."

Although marijuana is not physically addictive, a user may develop a psychological dependence on it. Users' behavior patterns, vision, timing and judgment are affected while under the influence of marijuana. Law enforcement agencies insist there is a definite relationship between marijuana use and violence.

The marijuana plant normally grows 12 to 15 feet high and looks like a tree. It will grow anywhere and, under optimum conditions, it may reach 20 to 25 feet.

The most characteristic thing about a marijuana plant is its leaf. It always has an odd number of leaflets and the bottom two point down. The leaflets are long and slender, pointed at the ends, with serrated edges. The buds and sticky residue from under the leaflets of the female plant are used to make hashish, the purest form of marijuana. Normally, when marijuana is purchased, it is made up of both the male and female plant parts and any other vegetable substance to make volume for sale. The user never knows what he is really getting.

Marijuana is one of the few plants not

pollinated by insects—only by the wind. "A grasshopper won't attack this plant, a bug won't go after it, a bee won't pollinate it, but a sailor will smoke it!" Methlie exclaims.

Chief Methlie explains where marijuana comes from, how to manicure it, roll it into "joints" or "sticks," and how to ingest it by eating, drinking or, the most popular method, smoking. He compares marijuana with the use and abuse of alcohol and discusses how users use the comparison in their attempt to legalize marijuana.

"The important thing to note about marijuana is that it does have a mild hallucinogenic effect and it is the perfect vehicle for introducing someone to LSD or heroin," Methlie says.

The U.S. government and the military look upon the use and possession of marijuana as a felony. Military men stand the chance of general court-martial and a dishonorable discharge when they use illegal drugs.

The House Select Committee on Crime recently made public a report estimating six million Americans used marijuana in 1969, netting illegal traffickers \$850 million. The committee figures are based on conservative estimates and the assumption that not all of the six million are habitual users. Some were "experimenters" and "social users." The report suggests that the sale of marijuana has become big business.

More important, and extremely more dangerous than marijuana, are stimulants and barbiturates. Of the two, barbiturates are the most potent and dangerous.

"We have a pill to take if you're not nervous—it will make you nervous. We are a nation of hypochondriacs," Methlie continues.

There are five or six million people in the United States on pills. The federal drug people say that last year alone there were four billion pills made illegally in this country.

Stimulants are nothing more than pick-me-ups, commonly called "co-pilots," "truck drivers" and "uppers"; they work on the central nervous system. They are subdivided into amphetamines and methamphetamines. The latter, and most potent, normally is called methadone or "meth," "crystals" and "speed." It can be injected, eaten or sniffed. According to Methlie, most young users prefer to inject it. The current trend is to get a tattoo into which they can inject without leaving telltale marks.

"If the kid doesn't have a tattoo he will shoot between his toes, under his tongue or in his armpit. A girl will often shoot herself in the breast. Parents don't check these areas," Methlie says. "A person who shoots speed is about a quarter-inch from heroin."

Barbiturates or "barbs" are nothing more than sleeping pills or "downers." Users get "high" on downers by fighting sleep.

Chief Methlie cautions that just because a pill is a certain color, doesn't indicate what's in it.

"You don't know what's in the pill—so don't take it! I find it inconceivable that any American citizen with half a day's education would go anywhere in the world, take a pill and actually ingest it, not knowing what it is. Because it's red doesn't mean it's sodium seconal. Because it's yellow doesn't mean it's nembutal. Because it's blue doesn't mean it's ambulet. And because it's blue and red doesn't necessarily mean it is tuanal (or rainbows). So don't take it!"

"The guy I'm worried about is the 'ding-dong' who comes up with what they call the 'giddyap' and 'whoa.' That's when you mix an amphetamine with a barbiturate. And, buster, I'm telling you it's like jumping on a horse and saying giddyap and pulling on the reins and telling him to stop at the same time."

In explaining how popping pills becomes

habit forming, Methlie says, "More people in this country are killed by barbiturate poisoning than all the other poisons put together, with the exception of carbon monoxide. It is not unusual for a person to die coming through a withdrawal from barbiturates. It takes 7 to 21 days. The first thing affected is the respiratory system. Normally, on the seventh day, the user gets pneumonia."

Most users get started on drugs through association. Surprisingly, many children learn from their parents. They see mother pop a pill when she gets up in the morning to get started, during the day to keep going, and at bedtime to put her to sleep.

Marijuana and pills usually lead to heroin. White heroin, the most potent, comes from the Orient; brownish, from Central and South America; and grey from Europe. The heroin user always has a special kit, the same kit used to shoot speed. He has a tourniquet, a razor blade, an eye dropper with a needle, a bent spoon, matches, a piece of cotton and heroin. The razor blade is used instead of the needle when the addict is too shaky to get the needle into a vein—he simply cuts the vein and pours the heroin in. When shooting heroin, the "mainliner" has to inject into a main vein. He must get it into his blood stream.

"Can't you just see a guy, he just shot 70 bucks worth of 'smack' into his arm," Methlie lectures. "His arm feels great. His head is caving in, but his arm feels great."

Like the user who shoots "speed," heroin addicts will also get a tattoo in an attempt to conceal "track" marks.

Drug addicts think they are a closeknit group. Their kits are interchangeable. If one addict in the crowd has syphilis or hepatitis, everyone in the crowd will have it.

A heroin addict in New York City told a state legislative committee hearing on drug addiction how he stole pocketbooks, sold drugs in school and broke into apartments to support his habit. He had seen most of his friends on drugs and didn't want to be left out. He is 12 years old.

One of the most dangerous and exotic drugs on the market is the hallucinagent LSD, or d-lysergic acid diethylamide.

"LSD is a very, very potent and dangerous drug," Methlie says. "On LSD you can re-trip, or re-flash, up to two years after use. The Navy can't afford this. We also know that it causes users to become mentally deranged and remain so indefinitely. There is strong likelihood that chromosomal breakdown in the user's body can be passed from one generation to another."

LSD (acid) is a synthetic chemical compound derived from a rye culture which has no smell or taste and can't be seen. It normally is mixed with charcoal, milk, sugar or even a barbiturate. It frequently is sold in sugar cubes, chewing gum, mouthwash, or even on the back of postage stamps.

"One drop of blood contains approximately one million cells. All we need to take a trip on LSD is the equivalent weight of one of these cells. According to government estimates, a regular two-suit suitcase would contain enough LSD to trip the entire continents of North and South America," Methlie continues. "No one should use LSD without a 'travel agent' or 'guide' to make sure the user doesn't do any window jumping. We can almost guarantee you that if you have any suicidal tendencies and take LSD under a depressed state of mind, you'll try to take your life." Chief Methlie cites a recent case in which a girl, under an LSD re-fresh, killed herself by jumping from a window.

His presentation is strong. He wants to scare young people out of drug experimentation. He shows them what drugs look like and explains what they can do to a person.

"Now we want to enlist the aid of the

young man in fighting this problem," Methlie concludes. "Without his help, we can't fight it. We must have the troops on our side."

TROOP WITHDRAWAL

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the question of troop withdrawal from the Republic of Korea is so vital to all concerned, I feel that the following article from the Washington Post of July 11 should be of interest to all who are interested in the security and welfare of both our countries:

KOREA: A TEST OF THE NIXON DOCTRINE

At Guam a year ago President Nixon put Asian allies on notice that the United States meant to reduce its Pacific military posture, and since then informal talks on troop reductions have been going on with the Asian country which is, apart from South Vietnam, under the heaviest external threat—South Korea. It is no surprise in Seoul that the United States has decided to cut its two-division 60,000-man force down toward one division and 35,000 men next year. It surely is a surprise, however, to the many people in this country and elsewhere who had believed that South Korea's uniquely exposed position—facing a powerful and openly menacing North Korea—would make it about the last place in Asia that American troops might depart.

For any reduction to go safely forward, three things will be required; it would be best if the President himself were to make them clear. First, to reduce North Korea's temptation to prepare another attack, it must be demonstrated that Seoul is fit to carry the extra load. Second, to bolster the South Koreans' self-confidence as well as to compensate for a partial American withdrawal, their army must be adequately strengthened or "modernized," as the Pentagon likes to put it. Third, the United States must show—by disposition of its tactical air units elsewhere, by airlift exercises, by preparation of the division remaining in Korea, and so on—that it retains the will and capacity to make good on its treaty pledge to aid Korea in the event of an "armed attack." Careful retrenchment should be exactly that, not a guise for avoidance of responsibility or an inadvertent invitation to trouble.

Senator Tydings called on the President three months ago to implement in Korea the promise of troop extrication inherent in the Nixon Doctrine. He raised some interesting questions whose answering becomes topical now. Will the units removed from Korea be disbanded or simply stationed somewhere else? What will happen to the tactical nuclear weapons reportedly emplaced on the Korean peninsula as part of the local American deterrent? Is the particular division to be withdrawn the "tripwire" one on the front line or the one set farther back in reserve? The key difference, Mr. Tydings noted, is that troops in a location to be a "tripwire" make American battle involvement more certain but, for that very reason, deprive Congress (and even the President) of the option of deciding whether the country should go to war.

Americans paid dearly to turn back North Korea's invasion in the early 1950s and they have a special interest in seeing the South enjoy progress and peace. At the same time, the desire to adjust to new realities, both

in foreign strategy and in home priorities, is very strong. This is why the administration's Korean plans have a particular sensitivity. Troop reduction there will provide the most important test so far of just how the Nixon Doctrine is to be translated from theory into practice. The manner in which a limited troop withdrawal is worked out with Korea and presented to the American people will be as important as the act itself.

DESPITE 12-YEAR ORDEAL, BISHOP WALSH IS IN GOOD CONDITION

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, we were all pleased to learn recently that the Government of Communist China has released Bishop James Edward Walsh after a 12-year imprisonment in that country.

Bishop Walsh is a native of my home county in Maryland and I have known the Walsh family all of my life. I share with them their joy and thankfulness for Bishop Walsh's release. I know that this turn of events is particularly gratifying to the bishop's brothers and sisters.

Bishop Walsh's brother, the Honorable William C. Walsh, a former member of the Maryland Court of Appeals, traveled to China in the early 1960's to visit with his brother and I know that he is especially happy to be able to look forward to his brother's return to this country.

Because of the universal concern for Bishop Walsh's health, I am including in the RECORD information furnished me by the State Department on his condition. This information is in the form of a release from my office:

BEALL SAYS BISHOP WALSH'S HEALTH IS GOOD

WASHINGTON.—Congressman J. Glenn Beall, Jr. (R-6th-Md.) reported Friday that a State Department spokesman has assured him that Bishop James Edward Walsh is "in reasonably good health and is very lucid" following his release from 12 years of imprisonment in Red China.

"As a close friend and neighbor of the Bishop's family," Representative Beall said, "I have shared their profound concern for his well-being for many years. I am today delighted to report to the citizens of our state that despite his long ordeal, Bishop Walsh is in good health and should rejoin his family soon."

Congressman Beall said that the Roman Catholic prelate, a native of Cumberland, Maryland, is now undergoing a physical examination at the Maryknoll Hospital in Hong Kong, where he was freed yesterday.

According to the Sixth District Representative, American Consulate officials there report that Bishop Walsh has complained of a slight backache, a condition which his doctors feel will improve with rest, and that during 12 years in Communist prisons, he has lost only 10 pounds.

"Bishop Walsh is now awaiting instructions from Church officials," Congressman Beall said, "and he does plan to return to the United States in the near future."

The State Department spokesman informed Representative Beall that the Bishop was given a physical examination on July 8 and then, to his surprise, told to prepare to leave within 30 minutes. Taken to a railroad

bridge which links the China mainland with British-held Hong Kong Island, Bishop Walsh walked unaided to freedom.

Representative Beall said that he was told that during his imprisonment, Bishop Walsh was not subjected to intensive interrogation or brutal treatment, and that he was not required to sign a confession or make a formal statement prior to his release.

CONSUMERS AND CHARTER FLIGHTS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, the CAB recently published a set of proposed new rules regarding charter flight organizing. On June 12, I filed my objection to this proposal, and since that time I have heard from numerous groups which would be adversely affected should these rules go into effect. One of the more interesting responses I have received is an analysis of the effect of the rules on consumers by Mr. Shelby Edward Southard of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., and I insert Mr. Southard's background paper in full at this point in the RECORD.

A LOOK AT THE CONSUMER'S STAKE IN LOWER AIR FARES THROUGH GROUP CHARTER FLIGHTS

(By Shelby Edward Southard)

Many consumer organizations have brought the advantages of low-cost charter flights to their members by arranging for group travel at about one-half of the cost of an individual ticket on a scheduled flight. On June 2, a number of groups attending the Consumers Travel Conference in Columbus, Ohio, learned how these tour bargains could be made available to more organizations.

On the plus side, the President recently announced a new International Air Transport Policy, which calls for uniformity and simplification of charter rules, and states that "charter services have been useful in holding down fare and rate levels . . . they can provide low-cost transportation of a sort fitted to the needs of a significant portion of the traveling public."

On the minus side, and seemingly to fly in the face of the President's policy, the Civil Aeronautics Board is pushing for restrictions on low-cost travel which, if adopted, would sharply curtail inexpensive study and vacation charters.

At this point, Congressional action would seem to be the only hope consumers have for breaking this impasse between Administration policy and the rules of an independent regulatory agency.

Given this situation, it behooves all of us to let Congress know where we stand on this issue.

The Federal Aviation Act calls for "the promotion of adequate, economical, and efficient service by air carriers at reasonable charges, without unjust discrimination, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices."

Despite this, one segment of the aviation industry—the charter specialists who offer low cost transportation—is threatened with proposed CAB rules and regulations that would sharply curtail the popular low-cost charter concept that was authorized by an Act of Congress. Many well-known American voluntary organizations—such as cooperatives, fraternal groups, trade unions, senior citizens, study groups of students and teachers, etc.—that now provide inexpensive travel programs for their members, would also be

severely restricted under the proposed CAB rules.

The right to travel is a strongly-held American belief. And charter airlines—known as "supplementals"—have brought transportation to Americans at lower costs than have ever before been available.

America's airline industry has two classes of travel—individually-ticketed, regularly-scheduled service over set routes, and group charters. Under the charter rules, each flight operates under a separate agreement in which a group hires the plane for a trip to destination of its own choosing. Thousands of fraternal groups, employee organizations, professional societies, consumer organizations, unions, and social clubs have enabled their members to enjoy such vacation wonders as Europe, the Caribbean, Hawaii and the Far East because charter travel brought the cost within range of modest budgets.

CONGRESS RECOGNIZED THE NEED

Charter specialist airlines were granted permanent operating authority by Congress in 1962. Ever since, these airlines—flying the same planes as scheduled airlines under the same federal safety regulations—have offered a new dimension in air transportation, bringing such trips within reach of moderate-income Americans.

In 1968, Congress recognized that the supplemental airlines had "become solid, responsible, safe and profitable business entities." It extended their authority to include a completely new type of charter, the inclusive tour (ITC). At that time the Assistant Secretary of Transportation said: "The supplemental carriers have provided the benefits and experience of air transportation to people who otherwise might not have traveled by air. The supplementals have provided a new degree of competitive endeavor which the scheduled airlines have been unwilling or unable to initiate despite encouragement by the (Civil Aeronautics) Board."

Here are some of different kinds of charter services:

Single Entity: A contracting party pays the entire cost of a plane-load charter. Examples include athletic teams, "incentive" travel for company sales personnel, etc.

Affinity: An organization charters the plane and the cost is prorated among the members making the trip. This type of charter is governed by numerous regulations that limit eligibility to individuals (and their immediate families) who are bona fide members of social, religious, fraternal, education or employee associations, not organized primarily for the purpose of travel.

Inclusive Tour (ITC): Full or split-load charters to a tour operator who organizes and promotes the tour and arrange the charter. Clients pay the tour operator. CAB must approve the tour, which must have three stopping points and last at least seven days. The cost to the client must include all hotel accommodations and surface transportation and be at least 110 percent of the lowest available individually-ticketed scheduled fare over the route.

WHAT CONSUMER GROUPS SAID

In 1968 during Congressional hearings many consumer, trade union, agricultural, fraternal, cooperative and senior citizen groups filed statements or testified in favor of having the Civil Aeronautics Board revise and update its charter regulations. They proposed to broaden low cost jet air travel and bring it within reach of many more Americans who cannot now afford to fly.

In this they were supported by testimony from the President's Consumer Advisor, Miss Betty Furness, who pointed to the need for preserving competition. Her successor, Mrs. Virginia Knauer, also spoke up for the consumer interest in a letter earlier this year to the inter-agency task force working on a new international air travel policy—with what effect is not yet clear.

Charter fares average 50 percent lower than individually-ticketed coach fares on scheduled airlines. This proposal would make it possible for many more people to plan vacations and study tours to different parts of the world by giving them access to charter travel.

In its desire to simplify the rules and to make low cost travel available to even more Americans, the supplemental airlines suggested a number of changes in the now 11-year-old affinity group rules. Key points are summarized here:

Expand the definition of "immediate family" of a charter passenger to include all his dependents, all members of his household, and close relatives.

Permit "special event" charters for groups, such as to the annual Rose Bowl.

Allow charters to members of automobile associations, who are already knowledgeable about safe, insured, and low-cost land travel.

Permit the sale of up to 20 percent of the seats on a charter flight to friends of members of the chartering group.

Permit married students on a charter study tour to take members of their immediate families along with them.

RESPONSE OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

But the Civil Aeronautics Board, rather than clarifying and simplifying its rules to broaden the opportunities for low cost charter air travel, now proposes to restrict it even further. Its proposal would eliminate many presently eligible groups from chartering trips for their members.

If the proposed rules are adopted, many clubs and organizations will find that they have taken their last modestly-priced vacation tour. And once the travel market has been given entirely over to the scheduled airlines it would not be long before their international price-fixing cartel—the International Air Transport Association (IATA)—would push international air fares upward. It has been demonstrated that only the availability of low cost fares through the charter airlines brings IATA-set fares down.

The public has long demanded low cost travel. But only when charter flights helped answer this demand did IATA come up with new group fares of its own. Some of these fares were designed only to deter groups from flying the charter airlines. Last year, at the very time they were announcing new lower-priced group fares, the IATA airlines also raised individual ticket prices by eliminating the traditional five percent discount on round-trip tickets. A CAB examiner recommended rejection. He was over-ruled by the Board.

Instead of clarifying its rules, CAB has proposed arbitrary standards to determine who may use affinity group charters. A large percentage of chartering organizations would automatically be ineligible for charter travel. Such long-established groups as the American Bar Association, the National Education Association, the Knights of Columbus, and B'nai B'rith would not be allowed to plan vacation charter trips for their members.

ORGANIZATIONS WITH MORE THAN 20,000 MEMBERS EXCLUDED

They would be denied this right because they have more than 20,000 members. In trying to screen out groups whose only purpose is to offer low cost travel (and which already are ineligible), the CAB has selected an arbitrary size to determine whether or not an organization is a bona fide "affinity group." A large organization that accepts a few too many members—no matter how well qualified—would find itself disqualified. Thus the government wishes to regulate voluntary organizations rather than airlines.

IATA, which never has encouraged low cost group travel tried to limit group sizes back in 1963. At that time the CAB refused to accept an identical membership size restric-

tion on the grounds that it was adverse to the public interest.

In its stated desire to assure that only bona fide groups take advantage of charter travel, the CAB now proposes a number of other rule changes that would curtail the public's right to low cost travel. These changes are couched in phrases that suggest a belief that many persons who "should be" traveling as individuals are members of large organizations for the sole purpose of obtaining cheap fares.

Chartering organizations, under the planned rules, would also be limited to a total of 2,000 seats in a calendar year. This is equal to eight charters on a modern plane such as a stretch DC-8, and fewer on the new jumbo jets. It would not matter whether the trips were for college students planning to study abroad, for football fans with tickets to a Bowl game, or for vacationers wishing to attend EXPO '70. A large group simply could not charter more than 2,000 seats in any one year.

It should be noted that waivers may be sought for any of the charter rules. But since there are no clear-cut, objective standards covering such requests, members of charter groups would be allowing CAB staff members—who are elected by no one—to determine which of them may exercise their Constitutional right to travel.

Some of the other ways in which the CAB proposes to identify those groups which are qualified to charter seem equally strange, if not capricious. Groups which have more than one class of member with different dues rates would automatically be disqualified. Thus, the National Press Club would no longer be allowed to plan its annual members' charter to Europe. Organizations that elect officers and directors every three or four years instead of every two years, or whose officers are elected by the directors rather than directly by the members, would also be barred, no matter how reputable these groups might be. Agricultural and marketing cooperatives would no longer be allowed to schedule charter trips for their members because of the nature of their business.

RULES THREATEN TO MAKE CHARTER TRAVEL DIFFICULT

Most intelligent persons, before embarking on a major trip, would expect to know not only where the airplane was going, but also where they would stay and what they would see and do while on their vacation. One of the proposed new rules would bar an assisting travel agent from sending descriptions of available land tours to organization members until after they have signed up for the charter flight. The consumer would have to put his money on the line for the flight without knowing what the full costs would be for the tour.

Nor would travel agents be allowed to help small and inexperienced groups in preparing their required passenger lists. Organizing a charter trip would be made much more difficult, even when a group is clearly qualified. In the face of rising costs of printing, postage and office work, the CAB intends to place a limit of \$4.00 per passenger on the amount of administrative expense allowed for organizing a trip. Present rules do not limit these expenses, but do require that receipts be filed if they are over \$750 per plane load.

Under another planned rule, financial risk for acceptable groups would be greatly increased because they would not be allowed to solicit their own members until after a charter contract has been signed. Making it more difficult for organizations to provide charters for their members, another rule would ban solicitation across chapter lines. This would eliminate many small chapters of "charterworthy" organizations now able to fill a plane with their own chapter's members and those of the same organization in nearby chapters. Thus, CAB would restrict

the very small as well as the very large groups.

With larger jets already in service, it is more difficult for chartering groups to fill a plane. When jets replaced smaller piston planes, the CAB recognized the problem and allowed up to three separate affinity groups—with at least 40 passengers each—to charter a single plane. The three group limit in a 400-seat jumbo jet would require the average group to have more than 125 members traveling together. In its proposed regulations, the CAB indicates it is willing to consider a relaxation of the three group limit, but does not clearly say it will.

During the heavy tourist season, one out of every five transatlantic travelers flies by charter. The present rules invite evasion, and are virtually impossible to police effectively because of the legitimate desire of people with modest means to seek the lowest fare.

COMPETITION HELPS HOLD DOWN FARES

The acceptance of charter travel has clearly established the public demand for additional low cost air transportation.

Where foreign airlines once dominated the transatlantic charter market, U.S. supplementals have contributed to a dramatic reversal in the trend. Their share of the charter market has climbed from 17 percent in 1963 to 50 percent last year, part of America's successful attempt to stop the gold flow from leaving our shores. During the same period, the total U.S. airlines' share of this market rose from 20 percent to 65 percent. The scheduled airlines have benefited from the growth of chartering, increasing their share from 5 percent in 1962 to 15 percent in 1969, a three-fold increase.

Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe last year cited competition by the supplementals as being "largely responsible" for transatlantic air fare reductions which were announced in November, 1969 by IATA member airlines.

Secretary Volpe said: "It seems certain that they (the supplementals) have demonstrated a clear public need for their services. In the past they have accommodated a lower income market of people who would not otherwise be traveling abroad. And now, threatened with more widespread supplemental operations, the scheduled IATA carriers have been compelled to lower their group fares to a competitive level."

The Senate Commerce Committee, in a 1968 report, said the supplementals are "a permanent and integral part of the national air transportation system. They have actively promoted the airline charter business to the point where it is a growing means of travel for American citizens who otherwise would have been denied the opportunity to take low cost vacations by air."

HOW COMPETITION IS BEING STIFLED

Only six percent of Americans have ever been abroad and only 50 percent have ever traveled by air. Despite the vast untapped millions of potential passengers anxious to travel, the world's scheduled airlines and the foreign governments who control them have not been content to compete openly in the marketplace. They have consistently tried to eliminate low cost charter travel through restriction of landing rights at foreign airports, predatory and often discriminatory pricing, and archaic rules governing who may charter a plane.

Scheduled airlines are now using new low group rates (subsidized by increased regular fares) in a concerted effort to drive U. S. charter airlines from the skies. If they are allowed to succeed, they will have eliminated the only challenge to their monopolistic rate-setting system.

The president of one foreign scheduled airline said of the supplementals: "They cater to the cheapest possible traveler and thus lower the yields of the domestic tourist

industry." There is a strong suspicion that if IATA succeeds in eliminating the supplementals, scheduled carriers would find it "necessary" to considerably increase their excursion and group fares and turn up their noses at the "cheapest possible traveler."

With most members of IATA government-owned, it has been easy to make the drive political as well as economic. Some European carriers have been successful in pressuring their governments to restrict landing rights for supplementals.

But who really suffers by this economic warfare? First, of course, the traveling public, which either pays more or is limited in its choice of destination.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON AVIATION POLICY

The consumer clearly has a stake in low-cost air travel. This right must be assured by Congressional enactment of a national aviation policy. This policy must recognize the concept of a total U.S. air transportation system that includes both the scheduled airlines, which specialize in individually-ticketed service, and supplemental carriers, which specialize in group transportation—charter flights at low fares. Such a policy, backed by U.S. government support for charter airline rights abroad, would broaden the base of the market to include millions of moderate income travelers who fly infrequently or not at all.

At the same time, what is urgently needed is a simplified, easily understood set of rules which would make low cost charter travel available to as many Americans as possible. Simplified, fair and easily enforceable rules would discourage cheating by the public. Group travel is in itself a restriction that is clearly distinguishable from individually-ticketed fares. This simple criteria would preserve the distinction between charter or group services, on the one hand, and individually-ticketed scheduled services, on the other.

Instead of proposing rules that deprive millions of Americans of charter flight opportunities, the government should adopt a policy and rules that make charter transportation more widely available, and on a more equitable basis for all Americans. In a nation where equality of opportunity is a national goal, the right to travel should not be abridged by arbitrary and irrelevant standards such as the size of an organization, or the date on which it elects its officers.

The entire U.S. aviation industry will be better served if our regulatory agencies adopt rules that keep air travel from becoming the exclusive preserve of the rich, the expense-account business traveler, and the jet-setter.

GALLUP POLL RESULTS FOR NATIONAL SERVICE ACT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker. On Monday, July 6, I placed an article from the Washington Post in the Record which reported a Gallup poll that showed 71 percent of the national population supports the National Service Act of 1970, which I introduced on June 10, with bi-partisan support.

I have now received a detailed breakdown of this poll from Mr. Gallup, Jr. This breakdown shows that this bill (H.R. 18025) has strong support in all parts of the country and among all groups of people.

The Gallup poll breakdown follows:

RESULTS OF GALLUP POLL

Question: Congress is now considering a proposal to replace the Selective Service System—that is, the draft—with a National Service System. Under this system a young man of 18 could choose to do any one of these three things: (1) He could volunteer for military service, (2) he could volunteer for civilian service—for example, helping in hospitals, teaching school, working in programs like VISTA, or (3) he could take his chances on being drafted.

How does this plan sound to you? Would you like your Congressman to vote for or against this proposal?

(In percent)

	Vote for	Against	Do not know/no answer
National.....	71	20	9
Sex:			
Men.....	68	25	7
Women.....	74	15	11
Age:			
21 to 29 years.....	80	18	2
30 to 49 years.....	69	23	8
50 years and older.....	68	19	13
Region:			
East.....	72	19	9
Midwest.....	74	19	7
South.....	69	21	10
West.....	68	23	9
Religion:			
Protestant.....	70	21	9
Roman Catholic.....	73	18	9
Jewish.....	86	9	5
Occupation:			
Professional and business.....	75	18	7
Clerical and sales.....	82	16	2
Manual labor.....	70	24	6
Farmers.....	59	26	15
Political party:			
Republicans.....	75	17	8
Democrats.....	71	19	10
Independents.....	69	24	7

WISE RULING ON BONDS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the recent California Supreme Court ruling voiding the State requirement for two-thirds approval of all bond issues by the voters of California. I would like to recommend an editorial in the News Register of Fremont, Calif., published by Abe Kofman, which has an excellent discussion of the ruling, to my colleagues and request that this essay be inserted in the RECORD because it is such a fine piece and deserves our recognition and attention:

"THE PEOPLE NEVER SURRENDER THEIR RIGHT TO KNOW"

(By Abe Kofman)

A JUST DECISION

In voiding the clause in the state constitution requiring a two-thirds affirmative vote for passage of local bond issues, the California Supreme Court has brought that particular part of the constitution into the 20th century.

For nearly 100 years in this state it has been the rule that approval of local bond issues is dependent on a two-thirds vote.

This requirement may have served a useful purpose when it was written into the constitution. Communication was slow, the educational level of the population was considerably lower.

But the provision long since has been an anachronism—California is one of only four

states in the nation with that archaic provision.

The decision on the high court was unanimous to strike down the two-thirds rule—which means that among the jurists there was absolutely no doubt about the validity of the decision. The court observed that in states with a simple majority rule, there is no evidence of more frequent bond defaults, lower credit ratings, or "extravagant public projects."

The court found that the two-thirds requirement in fact amounted to special privilege for negative voters—giving them twice the voting power of affirmative voters. This violates the voter's right of equal protection under the law, the judges ruled.

It was paradoxical that the court declined to make the ruling retroactive to Nov. 1969, as sought by San Franciscans desirous of validating the majority approval of two bond propositions for financing schools and parks.

The ruling is being hailed with satisfaction by individuals and groups within communities who know the need for greater financing for schools, and who have lost out in recent years to self-styled "taxpayers rebellion" minority.

In terms of equity and maturity, the ruling cannot be faulted. In a sense, it becomes an extension of the one-man one-vote ruling which has served to make the franchise more meaningful to large segments of the population.

A GREAT UNDERSECRETARY OF STATE

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have in the diplomatic service right now a distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire who would make an admirable successor to Secretary Richardson as Under Secretary of State. I refer to the Honorable Robert Hill of Littleton, N.H., our present Ambassador to Spain.

A former Ambassador to Mexico and prior to that to Costa Rica, Ambassador Hill is experienced in the requirements of the Department of State, yet hard-nosed enough to be able to contribute materially to the important responsibilities of the Under Secretaryship of a huge Government department that has baffled virtually all who have sought to restore it to the dignity, efficiency, and responsiveness so essential in affairs of State. The Ambassador is also of unimpeachable loyalty to President Nixon and his administration.

In this connection a recent column by the distinguished veteran reporter Ralph de Toledano, appearing last week in the Manchester, N.H., Union-Leader, is of interest:

VETERAN REPORTER FEELS ROBERT HILL BEST FOR UNDERSECRETARY: LITTLETON MAN PRIME STATE DEPARTMENT PROSPECT

(By Ralph de Toledano)

The White House is searching for a new undersecretary of state.

In some ways, this job is more important than head of the department. For while the Secretary occupies himself with high policy, it is the undersecretary who must keep the wheels of state rolling.

The President, of course, must be receiving

advice from every friend, hanger-on, and political operator as to whom he should appoint—and to be quite candid about it, he does not need my suggestion as to who his nominee should be.

But for whatever it is worth, let me drop one name into the hopper. Having been for many years a State Department watcher, my choice may ring a few bells and open a few eyes.

He is Robert Hill of Littleton, N.H., now our Ambassador to Madrid, and one of the outstanding men in government service.

Never having met Ambassador Hill, I can lay claim to objectivity in proposing him. I have, however, observed Ambassador Hill from a distance and I earnestly believe that he would fit the job to a T.

Over the years, Mr. Hill has been one of those experts closest to Mr. Nixon on foreign policy. He was, in fact, one of the President's most trusted foreign policy advisers during the 1968 campaign. And before this, he had been one of those who rallied 'round the flag during the years of Mr. Nixon's incredible political comeback.

Bob Hill's life and background underscore his suitability for the important post of undersecretary of state. In the true-grit tradition, he worked his way through Dartmouth, first as a football star and then, when he was badly injured, digging ditches and playing poker.

This, in itself, was a good introduction to diplomacy.

To this, he can add such experience as a corporate stint with Grace Lines in Washington and as a staff member of the Senate Banking Committee, both of which taught him how to navigate the treacherous shoals of Capitol Hill.

His contacts with the intelligence community are also outstanding. He not only served the super-secret Office of Strategic Services, the precursor of the Central Intelligence Agency, but he also worked closely with other agencies in the years that followed.

As ambassador to Costa Rica, in the days of the great Communist push on Central America, he was one of those who gave significant backing to the late Ambassador Jack Peurifoy, who carried the burden in Guatemala of restoring democratic government to the embattled little republic.

As ambassador to Mexico, he was one of the few who understood precisely where Fidel Castro was heading—to the extent that the Castro underground put a price on his head.

Perhaps more important than Ambassador Hill's diplomatic attainments is his ability to work with people. During his days on the Hill, he shared the confidence of the late Senator Charles W. Tobey, of Sherman Adams, and of Senator Styles Bridges—all of whom were at sword's point with one another.

In a department as full of prima donnas as State, Bob Hill would bring order and system as well as the kind of political savvy so sadly lacking nowadays at Foggy Bottom.

As an outsider looking in, I am perhaps more interested in what Ambassador Hill could do to bring about the reorganization of the State Department which President Nixon promised but which he has so far been unable to attain.

A recent secret report prepared for the White House shows that there are 40 important jobs still held at the State Department by holdovers from the Kennedy Administration.

Those 40 men are completely out of step with the Nixon Administration, and, to date, they have sought to frustrate what the President and his advisers are trying to do—in the creation of a viable foreign policy for this country.

Under an Undersecretary like Bob Hill, they would either shape up or leave—and the country would benefit vastly from this.

Since he was posted to Madrid, Amba-

sador Hill has been doing an excellent job representing America's interest in a crucial geopolitical area.

But what Mr. Nixon needs far more than a first-class diplomat in Spain is a man of unquestioned loyalty to the Administration to bring about the changes in the State Department which, political observers agree, are long overdue.

SURVEY SHOWS THAT PEOPLE SUPPORT THEIR PRESIDENT

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, as of mid-June, from the nearly twenty-four thou-

sand residents of the 28th Congressional District of New York responding to my annual questionnaire, 58.82 percent of the women, and 66.51 percent of the men feel President Nixon is doing a satisfactory job.

I believe it is interesting to note, that by coincidence my annual questionnaire to the residents of the 28th District, was sent out just 2 days following the April 30, 1970 announcement by President Nixon of the move of our Armed Forces into Cambodia, with the bulk of the responses reaching my office during the hectic weeks immediately following that Cambodian thrust.

Considering the timing of the arrival of the questionnaire in the hands of the voters, I believe it is interesting to note that although, like most of my colleagues, at a time when my mail was running

overwhelmingly against Cambodia, on a multiple choice question which allowed five alternatives 37.23 percent of the men, and 35.98 percent of the women indicate they favor the President's withdrawal and Vietnamization policy. Only 13.40 percent of the men and 12.91 percent of the women indicated they want immediate and unilateral withdrawal.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the results of my annual questionnaire which was sent to all the postal patrons in the 28th Congressional District. In my opinion, the heavy response I received to the poll reflects a high level of interest from the people in my area on national affairs.

Complete results of this year's 28th District survey are as follows:

PART I (RESPONDENTS CHECKED 1 OF THE ALTERNATIVES)

[In percent]

	His	Hers		His	Hers
1. To combat inflation the President should—			5. To date the Nixon administration's performance has been—		
(a) Cut Federal spending.....	30.28	25.07	(d) Good.....	41.69	35.24
(b) Establish wage and price controls.....	21.84	17.62	(b) Unsatisfactory.....	25.56	26.80
(c) Cut Federal spending, establish wage and price controls and continue tight money policy.....	17.13	18.61	(c) Fair.....	24.82	23.58
(d) Cut Federal spending and establish wage and price controls only.....	14.15	15.88	(d) No response.....	7.94	14.40
(e) Continue tight money policy only.....	6.46	6.46			
(f) No response.....	9.93	16.13			
2. To fight pollution the Congress should—					
(a) Enact the President's \$10,000,000,000 clean-water program, plus national air quality standards.....	34.74	30.53			
(b) Spend even more and pass stricter laws.....	35.49	34.25			
(c) Leave the problems to the States.....	19.61	18.61			
(d) No response.....	10.18	16.38			
3. To end the war in Vietnam I favor—					
(a) President Nixon's phased withdrawal and Vietnamization.....	37.23	35.98			
(b) Military escalation to win.....	20.10	14.15			
(c) Total withdrawal by Dec. 30, 1970.....	16.38	16.88			
(d) Immediate unilateral withdrawal.....	13.40	12.91			
(e) Unilateral cease fire and continued Vietnamization.....	4.22	4.77			
(f) No response.....	8.69	15.39			
4. The historic American moon landings have sparked new debate on our space priorities. Should our space program be—					
(a) Reduced.....	36.48	43.43			
(b) Continued at present rate.....	35.74	29.53			
(c) Funded so this country retains space lead.....	19.36	12.41			
(d) No response.....	8.44	14.64			

PART II (RESPONDENTS CHECKED 3 OUT OF 8 ALTERNATIVES)

PART III

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No response		Yes	No	No response
Do you favor—				7. Easing Federal minimum penalties for possession and use of marijuana?			
1. The Nixon welfare reform plan with work incentives and an income floor?				His.....	32.51	57.82	9.68
His.....	68.74	15.64	15.64	Hers.....	27.30	55.84	16.88
Hers.....	63.78	11.67	24.57	8. Legalizing abortion?			
2. The goal of draft abolition and development of an all-volunteer service?				His.....	66.00	23.09	10.92
His.....	59.06	29.04	15.64	Hers.....	59.06	22.83	18.12
Hers.....	53.85	27.05	19.11	9. The sale by the United States of airplanes and arms to Israel?			
3. Continuation of present Federal farm-price support programs?				His.....	48.89	34.50	16.63
His.....	20.85	62.54	16.63	Hers.....	39.95	37.47	22.58
Hers.....	18.86	56.58	24.57	10. Making bombing and bomb threats a Federal offense?			
4. Lowering the voting age to 18?				His.....	82.39	5.46	12.16
His.....	39.56	51.75	8.71	Hers.....	75.93	4.72	19.36
Hers.....	38.71	45.41	15.88	11. The second stage ABM deployment?			
5. A national health insurance program?				His.....	42.93	35.98	21.10
His.....	50.13	36.73	13.15	Hers.....	33.50	33.50	33.01
Hers.....	47.40	33.26	19.36	12. Legislation to liberalize controls of U.S. trade with Communist nations?			
6. Legislative prohibition against use of U.S. combat forces in Laos, Thailand, and Cambodia?				His.....	44.28	39.80	15.92
His.....	35.24	52.61	12.16	Hers.....	38.81	37.81	23.39
Hers.....	38.22	40.95	20.85	13. Congressional inquiry into conduct of Justice Douglas?			
				His.....	49.63	33.75	16.63
				Hers.....	43.68	31.52	24.82

CONSUMER PROTECTION—LEGISLATION TO END THE SHRINKING BILLING PERIOD PROBLEM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 13, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing, with 33 cosponsors, legislation to end the shrinking billing period problem—a problem which thousands of consumers experience daily.

Whether by inadvertence or by intention, creditors often send out their periodic billing statements at too late a date for their debtors to pay in time to avoid the imposition of finance charges. This practice—the shrinking billing period problem—is remedied by the legislation today being reintroduced.

My colleagues who have joined me in this bill are:

Mr. ASHLEY, of Ohio.
Mr. BROWN of Michigan.
Mr. BROWN of California.
Mr. BURTON of California.
Mr. CONYERS, of Michigan.
Mr. DADDARIO, of Connecticut.
Mr. DELLENBACK, of Oregon.
Mr. ESCH, of Michigan.
Mr. FARBSTEIN, of New York.
Mr. FEIGHAN, of Ohio.
Mr. FISH, of New York.
Mr. FRASER, of Minnesota.
Mr. HALPERN, of New York.
Mr. HARRINGTON, of Massachusetts.
Mr. HAWKINS, of California.
Mr. HOWARD, of New Jersey.

Mr. HUNGATE, of Missouri.
Mr. KOCH, of New York.
Mr. LOWENSTEIN, of New York.
Mr. LUKENS, of Ohio.
Mr. MIKVA, of Illinois.
Mr. MINK, of Hawaii.
Mr. MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania.
Mr. MORSE, of Massachusetts.
Mr. MURPHY, of New York.
Mr. OTTINGER, of New York.
Mr. PODELL, of New York.
Mr. ROSENTHAL, of New York.
Mr. RUPPE, of Michigan.
Mr. ST GERMAIN, of Rhode Island.
Mr. TIERNAN, of Rhode Island.
Mr. TUNNEY, of California.
Mr. CHARLES WILSON, of California.

The legislation which I and my 33 colleagues are introducing amends the Truth in Lending Act to prohibit finance charges under an open end credit plan from being imposed unless the outstanding balance upon which the finance charge is based is mailed at least 21 days prior to the date by which payment must be made in order to avoid imposition of that finance charge. Thereby, debtors are given a reasonable period of time within which to pay their bills.

At present, billing statements are often sent out just barely before, the payment due date. And, in fact, they are often sent out even after that date, as reported by the Federal Trade Commission, which, in its Consumer Credit Policy Statement Number 3, issued on April 30, 1970, and concerning the "shrinking billing period" problem, has stated:

"The Federal Trade Commission has received many complaints from the public concerning the practice of some retailers who,

in connection with revolving or "open end" credit accounts, send periodic billing statements several days or weeks after the billing date indicated on the statement.

Obviously, consumers who are perfectly willing to pay their bills are being penalized by this practice. If given sufficient notice of the amount they owe, they would readily pay promptly. Because they are not given this notice, they are forced—through no fault of their own—to experience the imposition of finance charges.

The Truth in Lending Act and implementing Regulation Z do not now set forth any specific time within which creditors are required to send billing statements to their customer. The legislation which I and my colleagues have today introduced closes this unwarranted gap, thereby ending an unjustifiable victimization of consumers.

QUESTIONNAIRE TO CONSTITUENTS

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, each year, through a questionnaire I seek the views of my constituents in the 11th Congressional District of Michigan on a wide variety of problems facing northern Michigan and the Nation. Following are the results of my 1970 poll:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	Undecided
I. Domestic policy:			
1. If the present rate of inflation continues through the summer should the Government impose wage and price controls?	72	22	6
2. Should the Government reduce the severity of the penalty for personal use and possession of marijuana?	27	70	3
3. If an impeachment resolution to remove Justice William O. Douglas from the Supreme Court is reported to the House of Representatives, should I vote in favor of that resolution?	43	45	12
4. Do you support the new lottery system for drafting young men?	62	28	10
5. Do you favor eliminating deferments, including occupational and educational, from the draft system?	53	42	5
6. As a part of his antipollution program to clean America's waters, President Nixon proposed that \$10,000,000,000 (\$4,000,000,000 Federal share) be spent over the next 4 years for construction of waste treatment plants. Do you consider the amount of money recommended: Too much, 10 percent; about right, 46 percent; not enough, 43 percent; undecided, 1 percent.			
7. How would you rate the job President Nixon is doing on domestic affairs? Excellent, 9 percent; good, 34 percent; fair, 32 percent; poor, 24 percent; undecided, 1 percent.			
II. Northern Michigan highways:			
Our Federal and State Governments are considering a northern Michigan highway program. 2 major proposals have been suggested. The first is to build a high-speed, limited-access east-west interstate through the upper peninsula. The estimated cost is about \$350,000,000. The 2d is to use all available resources to upgrade existing roads and highways, and to create major trunklines from existing highways such as M-28, U.S. 41, and U.S. 2 in the upper peninsula and highways U.S. 23 and U.S. 131 in the lower peninsula. Which alternative would you prefer: 1. An interstate highway through the upper peninsula? (25 percent). 2. Upgrading present roads and highways and developing trunklines from existing highways? (73 percent). Undecided, 2 percent.			
III. Russia, China, and national defense:			
1. Do you approve of an ABM (antiballistic missile) defense system for the United States?	69	24	7
2. Do you believe the Red Chinese will represent a serious military threat to the United States?	61	33	6
3. Should the United States extend diplomatic recognition to Red China?	55	41	4
4. Do you support the current SALT (strategic arms limitations talks) negotiations with the Soviet Union?	74	20	6
IV. World trouble spots:			
1. Vietnam. To resolve the conflict in Vietnam should President Nixon: (a) Continue his course of gradual withdrawal, forcing the South Vietnamese to assume a larger role in the war? (59 percent). (b) Immediately withdraw all U.S. forces from Vietnam? (23 percent). (c) Turn the war over to the military Joint Chiefs of Staff—giving them the manpower and bombing authority they feel necessary? (17 percent). Undecided, 1 percent.			
2. Cambodia: (a) Do you support President Nixon's decision to commit ground troops against Communist sanctuaries and supply lines in Cambodia? (b) Do you feel a firm time limit (that is, 6 to 8 weeks) should be placed on U.S. ground combat operations in Cambodia?			
3. Middle East. Should the United States: (a) Give support to Israel—including military equipment? (b) Give support to the Arab nations—including military equipment? (c) Provide no arms, but have the 4 powers, (United States, France, Russia, Britain) work to achieve a settlement of the Arab/Israeli dispute? (d) Adopt a strict hands-off policy?			
4. President Nixon. How would you rate the President on his handling of foreign affairs? Excellent, 11 percent; good, 39 percent; fair, 29 percent; poor, 20 percent; undecided, 1 percent.			

RESEARCH AT CLEMSON
UNIVERSITY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, a research team from Clemson University, located in my district in South Carolina, is presently exploring exciting new possibilities based on the idea of using okra gum as a friction-reducer. Applications of this procedure offer new hope for people suffering from high blood pressure and other circulatory disorders. The following article from the current issue of *Clemson World* details some aspects of experiments undertaken at Clemson with okra gum, and I commend this excellent summary to the attention of Members of Congress and the American public:

RESEARCH AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

CLEMSON, S.C.—People suffering from certain types of high blood pressure may soon get relief from the lowly okra plant—not by eating it, but by having okra gum injected into their bloodstreams.

The possibility is being explored by a Clemson University research team which has discovered that tiny quantities of okra gum, a slimy fluid derived from crushed okra stems, can make water and other liquids flow faster in pipes.

The gum acts as a friction-reducer by cutting down on the turbulence, or agitation in a fast flowing liquid, the researchers say.

Their experiments have already shown that okra gum, which is compatible with human blood, greatly reduces the pressure required to pump beef blood through a tube.

The team is planning further experiments with equipment that simulates the human circulatory system.

"A suitable friction-reducer could prove extremely useful in treating high blood pressure, atherosclerosis and helping prevent hemolysis, the destruction of blood cells by blood turbulence," says Dr. Walter E. Castro, fluid mechanics engineer in charge of the research.

Many substances have this unique friction-reducing characteristic, including many synthetics and natural materials like locust bean gum and Irish moss (a form of seaweed), says Castro.

"Using concentrations of okra gum in water of about 25 weight parts per million (wppm), we have gotten friction reduction of up to 80 per cent, which is comparable to the best friction-reducing additives in use today," he says.

A concentration of 25 wppm is approximately equal to the amount of soluble okra gum that can be piled on one side of a nickel, then poured into 200 gallons of water.

Friction-reducing additives already have a wide variety of important applications other than possible medical use as blood flow controllers.

They can be used to get great bursts of speed out of ships like ice breakers and rescue boats, to put out fires quickly by getting more water faster through fire hoses, and to greatly expand the capacity of irrigation and sewage piping systems.

At least one other institution, engineers are attempting to ease blood flow with friction-reducing chemicals, but their experiments are with synthetic materials, says Castro.

"All such additives will eventually break down in the bloodstream, but when okra gum breaks down, it has the advantage of serving a useful purpose as a natural food substance, like glucose," he says.

The idea of using okra gum as a friction-reducer occurred four years ago when Castro and an associate were discussing friction-reducers, most of which are high molecular weight polymers composed of long chains of tightly linked molecules.

"We noted that these polymers are very sticky when slightly wet," says Castro. "We suddenly realized that okra has this same thickness, so we bought some okra, boiled it and filtered the mash, and made initial tests to see how the gum would affect water flow in a pipe."

They found that small amounts of the okra gum produced tremendous friction-reduction. A grant from the Water Resources Research Institute at Clemson funded their study of okra gum during the next three years.

The jump from water pipes to blood vessels was a logical step after they discovered that a Marquette University medical researcher had used okra gum as a blood plasma substitute, proving its compatibility with human blood.

The next phase of the research will be conducted by a multidisciplinary task force composed of Dr. Castro, whose specialty is fluid mechanics; a veterinarian, Dr. Barry W. Sauer; and a polymer chemist, Dr. Michael J. Eitel.

They will investigate the effects of the additive on blood flow in a simulated human blood system. They also will try to develop a way to stabilize okra gum's molecular structure to prolong its effectiveness in the blood stream.

ATTITUDE CHANGE IN
CORRECTIONS

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I returned yesterday from a 5-day tour of seven juvenile corrections facilities in five States as part of the work of the Select Committee on Crime in the area of street crime and juvenile justice. The situation generally in our correctional institutions is deplorable, but there are rays of hope. There are institutions which are seeking to change the attitudes of the inmates through guided group interaction and other imaginative programs.

Somewhat later I hope to make a report on general conditions in juvenile corrections, based upon the observations of the Crime Committee members who participated in the tour and on the work of our staff in this vital area. It is my hope that we will also be able to make meaningful recommendations for action by the House of Representatives and by States and local governments.

I was reminded, however, during the tour of an experience which I had earlier this year in a visit to an adult correctional facility—the Shelby County Penal Farm in Memphis, Tenn. It was my privilege to witness there the results of a very imaginative attitude-changing program and to speak to the first graduating class of inmates who have undergone this training. I believe my remarks on that occasion which indicate something of the nature of the correctional problem we face and also my belief, strengthened now by my latest tour, that it is possible to change attitude and produce correc-

tional institutions that really correct. I request permission to insert my remarks at this point:

INMATES OF SHELBY COUNTY PENAL FARM

Mr. Chairman, the honorable executives, distinguished commissioners, and other officials guests; ladies and gentlemen—all:

I have attended many commencement exercises in my life, and I've made many commencement speeches. But, heretofore, I've usually been speaking to a group of young people who are going off into the experience of life. This evening, I'm speaking to a group of gentlemen—I observe that they are mostly young—who are not only going out into the experience of life, but going out soon into the enjoyment of freedom, and you are engaged in preparing yourselves for that challenge and opportunity.

I am Chairman, as has been indicated, of the Select Committee on Crime in the House of Representatives of our Congress. Our Committee is trying to find ways and means by which we may propose legislation to the Congress, or advocate policies for our federal government, which will reduce the terrifying volume of crime which is inflicted upon our fellow citizens in this country, the rate of which is generally rising all over our land. And the people are concerned about it. Only yesterday afternoon, we passed in the House of Representatives a very stern severe bill governing the administrative procedures for the prosecution of crime in the District of Columbia, where crime has been increasing over the last few years. We are all concerned about how we can reduce the numbers of those who commit crimes; who take the lives of our fellow citizens' deprive them of their property; invade their rights; take away from them their freedom.

And one of the areas in which our Committee is principally interested is that of the correctional institutions of our country.

The Chief Justice of the United States, speaking only a little while ago before the Association of the Bar of New York City, said that 75 percent of the people who have been incarcerated in our correctional institutions—once the doors are open—once they walk out into the thrill of freedom—stay out only a short time before they are returned to the halls of the institutions from which they so recently departed.

Now the Shelby program which we are here this evening to observe and which is so interesting to me and to my Committee, is a program, as I understand it, which tries to do something to the heart of the man who is in a correctional institution—in this institution. It tries to do something to build the determination of a man who has been deprived of his liberties for some offense that he committed. It tries to do something for the will of the individual, and to bring into that man's mind and heart an unrelenting, unfaltering, unfailing effort to enjoy the freedom which he will soon come to have; to become a useful and constructive citizen; and to enjoy some of the great blessings that this wonderful land of ours offers to those who are willing and disposed to take advantage of them. The frustrations that people feel can be overcome by confidence; in your case, by the knowledge of skills acquired here, if you didn't possess them previously; the determination to succeed, the unwillingness to accept failure.

This afternoon, I was holding hearings with my Committee Members in the City of Baltimore, and we had three witnesses whom a lot of our people in this country would like to have seen and heard. One of them was Jim Parker, the great offensive lineman of the Baltimore Colts for eleven years. Another was Lenny Moore, another great player on the Colts team, and the third man was Ordell Brasse. They were giving their testimony, because our subject was youth crime, to a panel of young people we had brought

together to get their points of view, to give us their attitudes, and to come up with any suggestions they might offer as to how crime, which is so prevalent among young people, could be reduced in our country today. And one of the things that one of these nationally recognized and honored football players said was, "Never give up; never get discouraged; never lose faith."

This fellow said, "When I first started to play football, I stayed on the bench, and the coach would send in one man after another until he got down to me; then he'd go back and start at the top again. And the next time we were in trouble and the coach was sending in players and replacements, I'd see one after another down the line go into the game, and I'd just be sitting there, so tense, waiting for the man moving down the line to come to me—when he'd get down to me—he'd start back over the head of the line again." He said, "I was very much discouraged, but I got hold of myself, and I said—well, there will be a day when he'll get down to me if I just keep playing my heart out every time I get a chance to go out on that field."

He became, of course, an All-American, and is now on one of the great teams of this country, the Baltimore Colts.

On the other hand, some of these young people there today said: "Is there any reason why a black boy in Baltimore should get a high school education? What reason is there? What hope is there for him?" And another witness told us that over 40 percent of the young people in the ninth grade in one of those Baltimore schools dropped out this year.

What a tragedy—for them and for their cities, and for their states, and for their country.

In this competitive world in which we live—when skill is so much in demand; when you have to compete with so many people who have been trained, have gotten an education—how serious and grievous is the handicap of the boy or the girl who doesn't have an education.

Another one of these young people said, "Well, I graduated from high school, but I haven't been able to get a job, although I made good grades—I made a B while I was in high school. A lot of these boys are drop-outs and get just as good jobs as I can get now; why should I graduate from high school?"

I said, "I'll tell you why. You have told me that you didn't try in a great many places to get a job; but just suppose that you started off on the same level with one of these dropouts."

"Do you think you could get ahead of him in a little while—with better education than he has? If you really set your head to it? If you're really determined to do so?"

I said, "When the people are promoted—you and that other man who got the same job and started in at the same time, and worked for that same employer—as they start to make promotions they'll generally begin to pick the ones who are the best qualified; the ones who can learn to do the job the better way—and there's where your education would come in as a benefit to you."

And I want to say to you men, who are here, for the time being, in this institution: "Don't be one of those in the 75 percent—one of the three out of every four who are finally separated from the institution who come back."

Those are the statistics. There may be some of you here now who fall in this group. I understand from some of the gentlemen who drove me out, that the rate of recidivism here is 70 percent—70 percent, gentlemen. It means that three out of every four of you who are here now have already been out and come back. You'd hardly believe it possible, would you?

Just think of it. Don't you enjoy the free air? The beauty of your city—or your state—or your country? Don't you desire the association of family and home and friendship of your own choosing? Don't you love the right to go where you want to go—when you want to go? Don't you like to be able to choose your own recreation? Don't you like to have the privilege of doing what you like to do and not what has to be a part of a program? Aren't you really capable of making your way in that world out there—and becoming one of the people who would be regarded as a successful person—holding a good job—making a good salary—driving a good automobile—wearing good clothes—living in an attractive home—providing well for your family and those you love? Aren't those things enough to make a man want to try to take advantage of the opportunity of freedom and liberty—and become a good, constructive, happy and satisfied—citizen of this country?

That's what this program is designed to do—to arouse and renew this determination: "I will not come back—because I like it out there."

Now, you could make a good living—every one of you men here I can see this. I was very much impressed by the intelligence—the personality—of the gentlemen I have seen and met here this evening. There's not a man here this evening within the sound of my voice who isn't capable of doing a good job, of being a respected citizen, or earning a good salary, and of living well, on the outside. There's just one thing he needs, and that is to want to do it.

Success, you know, just doesn't come and jump on your back and put its arms around your neck and hold onto you in spite of your efforts to get away from it or run out from under it. That isn't the way success operates. You have to chase it a little, you know. You have to run after it. You have to want it. You have to appreciate it. You have to value it enough in order to bring it within your grasp and within your enjoyment. Some of these young people who are coming along today—well, it seems to me, sometimes, that they don't really want to enjoy life.

I was born a poor boy on a farm in East Alabama, and I dare say a lot of these prominent citizens who are here this evening had humble beginnings in life. But, somehow, somebody lighted a spark in our minds and our hearts. We wanted to get out of the little communities in which we were born. We wanted to move into a larger circle of friends, to more satisfying and challenging activity—and, fortunately, we were able to get an education. I said in that Committee meeting this afternoon, "I often shudder to think of what would have happened to me, how empty my life would have been, if the Lord, and my good mother and father, and some good friends, had not helped me to get a good education that helped me to have a stimulating and happy life."

If you've been given good help, there's no reason why everybody in this country can't live a good life. Jobs can be found—and I'm advised that there's a group of private citizens who are publicly interested and concerned about your welfare—that is working with each one of you gentlemen not only to help you while you're here, but to help you when you get out.

Go out and say, "Yes, I made a mistake once, but I'm not going to make that mistake again. I learned a lot up there. Somehow or another, I got hold of myself, up there, better than I ever have. For the first time in my life I've come to have purpose in my heart, purpose in my life. I want to do certain things. I want to accomplish something. I want to be somebody. I'm a new man because something has got hold of me that I haven't felt before. And I'm going on now—towards those stars out there. I think they're leading me into a happier experience than I've had before now."

And that's the best answer I know of to what we call recidivism—repeaters. I'm interested in this as a government official and as a citizen. I want to help the individual. At the same time I want to help the victims on whom they might inflict crime to be free of that potential injury if they went out and committed another offense.

I want to help my fellow citizen too. Let me tell you something, you younger men. These years are slipping away from you very fast. You don't realize it until you begin to get up into a higher age bracket. I'm 69 years old. And while I can cut a caper here if you want me to, I know that you live a lifetime before you realize it. I just want you to know that these years are important. And so are those years that you are going to start living when you get out of here, they're important years. Just make the best of them.

"I've known Allen Cherry for a long time—he's a fine, able gentleman. I've had a very happy experience with Mr. Kindig. I've known Paul Myers, who is the head of this company, for a long time. He's a genius in promoting—a genius in stirring people up and making them want to do things, trying to give them the keys to unlock the doors and the treasures of success. They are very capable people. This is the first institution, they tell me, that has tried this program. And they tell me that the reports that they are getting are very stimulating, that you can tell a difference in the attitude of these gentlemen who are taking this program. They, too, are beginning to find themselves awakened to new understanding and new determination, and to a new will to succeed. If you can do that with a program like this—if you can do it here in this institution—in Shelby County in Tennessee—you can do it in every institution in this country where men are confined. And if we can just cut down by 50 percent the number of repeaters, then think of the contribution we will have made to the country, not to speak of the happiness that would be in every one of those lives which wouldn't be there if they didn't have that successful experience when they go on the outside."

Now, gentlemen of this institution, you graduates whom I'm proud to see here this evening, and proud to see you receive these certificates.

Back in the days in Scandinavia when those brave and stout-hearted people went out in their little ships to ply the rough seas of the world—before they left their little home port, the story is—their minister would go aboard their vessel and he would call all those sailors around nearby and then he would give them what they called the "fisherman's benediction." As he stretched out his hand upon them—those rugged, strong men—he gave them this blessing: "May the Lord keep thee and bless thee; grant thee favoring winds, a safe voyage, and stout hearts for the storm." And I want to say to you graduates here this evening, "May the Lord bless thee and keep thee when you go out of this institution. May He grant you favoring winds of happiness and success. May He grant you safe harbors of security and may He give you stout hearts for the temptations and the struggles and the problems which will confront you, and with those stout hearts you can overcome."

Thank you and good luck to you all.

DAY OF PATRIOTISM

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on July 4 this year, I had occasion to participate

in the "Day of Patriotism" at Kenbridge, Va. This occasion was sponsored by the Jayettes of Kenbridge. One year ago, the same group sponsored the first "Day of Patriotism" for Kenbridge. It was a wonderful event but this year the Jayettes in conjunction with the Jaycees and other interested parties put on a great demonstration of patriotism second to none ever held in Southside Virginia.

I commend the sponsoring group for the great work it has done in the kindling of patriotism in the hearts and minds of our people and for bringing about a realization that America has a great heritage that we must protect and that we have a great Nation second to none. I feel that the entire Nation owes this group a debt of gratitude for sponsoring such a worthwhile undertaking and for sparking and renewing our faith in America and the great heritage we have.

The speaker of the occasion was an outstanding American, a native son who was born and raised in Kenbridge, educated at its high school and graduated from the Military Academy, Maj. Gen. S. E. Gee, U.S. Army, Commanding General, U.S. Army Physical Disability Agency, Washington, D.C. General Gee has served America in the Army in practically every capacity available. He has been a great soldier, a great patriot and a distinguished American. He brought a great message to those of us present at Kenbridge on the night of July 4th and because of the splendid message and my desire to make it available to others throughout America, I include it with my remarks to be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mr. Speaker, the address of General Gee is as follows:

NATIONAL WILL

(By Maj. Gen. S. E. Gee)

I thank you for inviting me to join with you in the celebration of this anniversary of our Day of Independence, proclaimed at Philadelphia on July 4, 1776. Especially, I desire to commend those who have planned, organized and participated in this day of patriotism in Kenbridge.

My topic this evening is inspired by our heritage and its relation to national will. National will is an intangible. It is the morale of a nation—the esprit de corps of a great people. It is a vital ingredient in national success. It is indispensable to national survival.

In just a few years, our country will observe the 200th anniversary of its birth. America is the first of the emerging nations. Ours has been the product of a determined national will.

Examples of this national will are found in each and every decade of our history since the first landings at Jamestown. An outstanding example was Valley Forge—a name that will live forever in our history. One historical description of Washington's Continental Army, 11,000 strong, moving into Valley Forge on December 19, 1777, is as follows:

"Toward this plateau the main army of the United States headed in December, as the air sharpened and powdery snow began to sift through pine and oak limbs . . . snow thickened, became stinging sleet, softened into pelting rain. The freeze came swiftly and the wretched, boggy roads stiffened into knife-ruts that slashed at rag-bound feet.

Washington said, 'You might have tracked the army . . . to Valley Forge by the blood of their feet.'

"The main column reached the plateau on the afternoon of December 19, and exhausted, chilled men lurching to their camp sites and lighted fires.

"For rations they had only what they might scrape out of their haversacks; and soon even the fires became a menace, for all their cheerful glow. Broken boots dried too quickly, cracked and split. Foot-wrappings charred and fell away from bruised, bleeding soles. Nothing very much happened in the Valley Forge lines. Men simply set their teeth and stayed alive, and thus kept alive the army that was the active expression of their cause, quite unaware of the deep glory of what they did."

When spring came, more than 4,000 of these men were dead. Among those who survived were Captains John Marshall and James Monroe. Later to become Chief Justice and President, respectively. Our own Lunenburg County had four companies at Valley Forge. Out of about forty men in each company, one had only seven survivors. Another had only five. The roster of those companies read much as ours from Lunenburg would read today.

Listen to the names of but a few:

William Winn, John Thompson, Charles Maddox, William Slaught, Thomas Wilkinson, James Johnson, Hugh Wallace, Dudley Terrell.

John Ragsdale, Isaac Allen, John Bailey, William Snead, William Gill, John Bell, Joseph Bishop, John Stokes, William Parrish.

Another example of national will was at Yorktown.

The army now had been seasoned by six bitter years of war. They, with the help of the French fleet, closed a circle around Cornwallis.

Under cover of darkness on the night of October 14, 1781, a unit of the Continental line quietly moved into position for an assault on the strongest point along the line, designated as Redoubt Ten. In order to achieve surprise, the commanding officer ordered that no muskets would be loaded and that the force storm the redoubt in a coordinated and carefully timed bayonet attack. After a fierce assault, the redoubt fell. Cornwallis' line then folded like an accordion. He had to surrender. The commander and leader of that assault was Lieutenant Colonel Alexander Hamilton. He later helped write our Constitution and became our first Secretary of the Treasury.

A company from Lunenburg and troops from other neighboring counties were most instrumental in driving Cornwallis into that trap.

It is a misnomer to refer to our war of independence as a revolution when compared to many other wars of revolution throughout the world. The others have been used for the purpose of establishing one person or group of persons in power. Then, by maintaining complete control over the military forces, they have stayed in power. Once this control was lost, then the heads would fall. The French Revolution ended in rule by Napoleon. The Russian Revolution supported the Bolsheviks—the Cuban supported Castro.

In contrast, our forefathers, wisely, directed that our military establishment "... support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic . . ." The President is the commander-in-chief of the military forces. The Congress is charged with raising the forces and appropriating the necessary money. In short, the military in the United States supports not one individual or specific group but the Constitution of all the people of the United States.

Each generation has met the challenges

of their time and has left our country a better place for their efforts.

I make no apologies for my own or that of my father's generation. I share in a sense of pride and accomplishment for the remarkable progress in my own lifetime.

Within five decades life expectancy has been increased by approximately fifty percent. The work day has been cut by a third, while the per capita output has more than doubled. We no longer fear epidemics of flu, typhus, diphtheria, smallpox, scarlet fever, mumps, polio, or tuberculosis.

During this time our people have lived through history's greatest depression. Many of them know what it is to be poor, cold and hungry. Because of this they were determined that following generations would have a better life, better schools, greater opportunities to succeed and follow one's life's ambition than they themselves had. Also, these people fought man's grisliest war and delivered mankind from the likes of the tyrant Hitler. They built thousands of schools, trained and hired tens of thousands of better teachers. Higher education has been made a real possibility for millions of youngsters—instead of the more prosperous few. A head start has been made in conservation, anti-pollution, and many other fields.

Of course, as always, there have been failures and there are jobs to complete and many yet to begin by those who follow. There are changes to be made, as always. Change just for the sake of change is false and dangerous. Change for the sake of progress and to enhance our heritage is proper. Sound procedures are established for such changes. But I pray to God Almighty that those who seek to bring about change will not destroy our country in the process.

It is one of the ironies of history that the times exact from each generation a special measure. This is true, especially today. There is great dissent and unrest in the land. But in our pursuit of dissent, let us not neglect our duty to those who protect the right of dissent or who serve our country in the field, nor abandon those who have fallen into enemy hands.

Our military forces are not in Vietnam by their own choosing. They are there because our duly constituted authorities have ordered them there. They face the most difficult task that is imposed on man—war on the battlefield. They are doing their duty to you and our Nation and will defend and die for us if need be. They are no less brave or determined than were those men at Valley Forge, Yorktown, Verdun, Guadalcanal, Normandy, or Heartbreak Ridge.

General Douglas MacArthur once told of a visit to his unit by the German Field Marshal Von Hindenberg shortly after World War I. Von Hindenberg said, "I predict that ultimately victory in war may depend largely upon the ability of civil populations to withstand attack. It will be a question of nerves. That nation will lose whose nerves will snap first."

May our nerves stay firm, and our courage never falter.

As part of our legacy from Philadelphia, we frequently quote the lines from the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

This is the part of the Declaration we like—"Pursuit of Happiness." However, we often overlook the last line of that same declaration: "And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

Thank you.

NATIONAL SOJOURNERS, INC.

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I submit for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted at the 50th Golden Annual Convention of the National Sojourners, Inc., on June 24-27, 1970, in Columbus, Ohio, in support of the President of the United States by that patriotic organization in his Southeast Asia military and diplomatic actions and extending the appreciation of the National Sojourners to the National Guard and civil police of the various States for their work to protect life and property during recent civil disturbances.

The National Sojourners is a Masonically oriented fraternity composed of commissioned officers and warrant officers (past and present) of the uniformed forces of the United States of America. We perform an outstanding service for God and country:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY NATIONAL SOJOURNERS, INC. SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES IN HIS SOUTHEAST ASIAN MILITARY AND DIPLOMATIC ACTIONS

Whereas, National Sojourners, Inc., is a Masonically oriented fraternity composed of commissioned officers and warrant officers (past and present) of the uniformed forces of the United States of America, organized into chapters for, among other important things, the purpose of supporting all patriotic aims and activities in Mansony, for developing true patriotism and Americanism throughout the Nation, for bringing together representatives of the uniformed forces of the United States (past and present) in a united effort to further the military need of National Defense, and for opposing any influence whatsoever calculated to weaken the national security; and

Whereas, the time is at hand when undue and unlawful pressures are being applied by radical elements of our society, through unlawful assemblies and demonstrations, riots and other violent disturbances, including the wanton destruction of private and public property, in a concerted effort to compel the President of the United States to withdraw our armed forces from Southeast Asia under circumstances and conditions constituting ignominious defeat for the United States; and

Whereas, the vast majority of National Sojourners by training and experience are knowledgeable in the strategic and tactical requirements for successful military operations, especially those pertaining to the safety of our own troops in the hazards of a withdrawal operation;

Therefore be it resolved that we, the delegates of the various chapters, at the annual convention of National Sojourners, Inc., assembled in Columbus, Ohio, this 26th day of June, 1970, again pledge ourselves and the members of our fraternity, individually and collectively, to the whole-hearted support of the President of the United States in his decision to seek out and destroy the sanctuaries of the Communist enemy in Cambodia; and

Be it further resolved that National Sojourners, individually and collectively, pledge that we shall continue to heartily support the President of the United States in whatever diplomatic, political and military actions he deems appropriate to bring the present conflict in Southeast Asia to a success-

ful conclusion and to secure for ourselves and the peoples of the affected free countries, a just and lasting peace with honor; and

Be it further resolved that the original of this resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, The Honorable Richard M. Nixon, The White House, Washington, D.C., and that copies hereof be sent to each of the Chairmen of the Armed Services Committees and the Foreign Relations Committees of both the Senate and the House, and to the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, through our Congressional Liaison.

Adopted this 26th day of June, 1970, at Columbus, Ohio, in National Convention.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION

Whereas, little or no recognition has been given to the National Guard and civil police of the several states for their honorable and selfless service when called upon by duly constituted authority to support and defend the Constitution of the United States and to protect life and property by upholding the laws of the land during recent civil disturbances;

Be it therefore resolved that National Sojourners, Incorporated, in National Convention assembled, express grateful appreciation and commendation to those devoted citizen-soldiers and law-enforcement officers for their devotion to the high ideals which have made this country great.

Be it further resolved that this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, The Honorable Richard M. Nixon, The White House, Washington, D.C., and to each of the Chairmen of the Armed Services Committees of both the Senate and the House of Representatives through our Congressional Liaison Officers, and to the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Governors of the several states and to the Mayor of the District of Columbia.

Adopted this 27th day of June, 1970, at Columbus, Ohio, in National Convention.

HALF WAY—DUCKING ROLLCALLS NOT ONLY ESCAPE VALVE FOR GUN-SHY LAWMAKER

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, an end to secrecy in House proceedings is a necessity if we are to retain the public's trust.

An editorial in the Wheeling Intel-ligencer, one of West Virginia's most influential newspapers, offers a good background on the situation and possible solutions.

I urge my colleagues to read this editorial and search their own newspapers for similar pieces. The public is demanding change and we must not ignore it:

HALF WAY—DUCKING ROLLCALLS NOT ONLY ESCAPE VALVE OF GUN-SHY LAWMAKER

Under the rules of procedure in the House of Representatives rollcall votes are required when a bill is up for passage or on a motion to return to a Committee. Otherwise action, in most cases, is by voice vote.

Pointing out that important amendments, which in many instances change the character of a proposition altogether, thus are anonymously decided, a number of Congressmen are pressing for reform.

The Democratic Study Group, for example, which includes more than 100 Liberals, is promising an "all-out effort" to revise the voting system to the end that members be required to stand up and be counted.

Nor is the movement confined to Democratic Liberals. A group of 40 Democrats and Republicans, a Wall Street Journal account notes, has proposed that after defeat of an amendment on a voice vote 44 members could compel a roll call.

"Other reformers," the account related, "would simply adopt the British system of having clerks record names of members, rather than merely count 'yeas' and 'nays', as they pass through teller lines. This proposal would save some of the time consumed by roll calls which take up to 45 minutes each.

Anything designed to take the secrecy out of legislative procedure would be a step in the right direction. While they are about revising the rules to this end, however, the reformers would do well to give some heed to the cover-up aspects of the Committee system, which permits troublesome proposals to remain buried indefinitely. This fault could be corrected by requiring every Committee to release to the floor, with or without recommendation, every proposition referred to it, after reasonable opportunity to study the matter, with hearings if necessary, had been afforded. This—giving the whole membership the benefit of research otherwise impossible—is the function of a Committee. It is not, or should not be, a committee's purpose to decide the fate of proposals entrusted to it for study.

BASTILLE DAY

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, today, across the Nation, people of French extraction and all freedom loving Americans, are observing Bastille Day, the French national holiday commemorating the triumph of the French Revolution. I would like to take this opportunity to remember that event as well as the great contributions that France and her people have made toward the development of democracy throughout the world.

On this date, in 1789, the people of Paris assaulted the Bastille, the city's royal prison. Although few political prisoners were actually being held there at the time, the liberation of this traditional symbol of the monarchy's oppression of the people served as a great impetus to the revolution, and proved that it could in fact succeed against the hitherto impregnable monarchy.

Bastille Day, then, is remembered as a symbol of the spirit of the French Revolution, and of the democratic principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity which have guided the French Republic throughout its long history.

On Bastille Day, we celebrate a victory of the French people, but also of all those free peoples of the world who have evolved so many of their democratic ideals from the example of the French experience.

I am sure that all Americans join with me in commemoration of the achievements of French democracy, and in recognition of the accomplishments of the French people throughout history. Our two nations share a heritage of democratic traditions and mutual friendship in which both can take great pride.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
OLDER AMERICANS ACT

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the fifth anniversary of the signing of the Older Americans Act into law.

The administration on aging set up by the act has in these 5 years started to mobilize one of our great resources—older Americans—to serve themselves and their country with a longer and more active life.

To commemorate the progress that has made, I submit the following article from the June-July 1970, edition of Aging for the attention of my colleagues:

JULY 14 IS FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT

Five years ago on July 14 the Older Americans Act was signed into law.

The Act established the Administration on Aging within the Federal Government and authorized funds for research, demonstration, and training and for allotments to States for programs for older people.

Today 53 States and Territories have had their State plans approved and are operating such programs. State plan approval is expected for two additional States before July 14, 1970.

PRIORITIES FOR 1970

AOA priorities include:

Strengthened State agencies.
Development of more comprehensive coordinated local and State programs.

Use of talents, skills, and experience of older Americans in volunteer service and employment activities.

Inclusion of services for the elderly in the Model Cities program.

Improved nutrition and transportation.
Development of truly multipurpose senior centers as vehicles for delivery services and opportunities.

An all-out attack on isolation.

Development of a national policy on aging.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER PEOPLE

Everywhere possible AOA is working to encourage the use of the talents and experience of older people.

Through demonstration programs, AOA has shown the effectiveness of older people both as employees and volunteers in school programs, in library services, in community programs of many kinds. The foster grandparent successes testify eloquently to their abilities—to the truth of the assertion that people are a national resource.

The Foster Grandparent Program has possibly had a greater effect on the "image" of aging than any other single thing and it is now funded and operated by AOA as an on-going activity. The oldest foster grandparent is now 90 and working regularly 4 hours a day.

Recently, Commissioner on Aging John B. Martin and Robert D. Moran, Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor, signed a Memorandum of Understanding agreeing to pool the resources of their agencies in Washington, the regions, and the States to fight discrimination in employment based on age.

SERVICES FOR OLDER PEOPLE

AOA has been working with the Department of Housing and Urban Development in its Model Cities program under a joint agreement to make certain that older people's

needs and older people's abilities are considered in services planned and opportunities offered in every Model City.

With the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Office of Economic Opportunity, AOA is working on ideas to improve the nutrition of older people and to extend the opportunity for them to use food stamps in a more meaningful way.

AOA was one of three agencies—the others from the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Transportation—funding a workshop on the transportation problems of older people late in May. The meeting is expected to result in greater knowledge and activity in this area and in recommendations for legislation.

Thirty-two projects have been funded under title IV of the Older Americans Act to test various methods for providing coordinated comprehensive community services for older people. Other title IV projects are concentrating on development of specific services.

For a fuller report on research, demonstration, and training during the first 5 years of the Older Americans Act, see page 10 of the May issue of *Aging*.

1971 WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE

As America moves into the decade of the 70's, the President has called a White House Conference on Aging with the goal of bringing into being a more realistic and comprehensive national policy for older Americans.

The Conference will build on the results of the first White House Conference on Aging a decade ago which led to enactment of the Older Americans Act.

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to commend an organization or an individual for an accomplishment which brings pride, enjoyment or has proven beneficial to other people in this Nation. It is doubly so when the recipient of such a commendation is not only a colleague in the House, but also a warm, personal friend, the Honorable THOMAS E. MORGAN.

"Doc" MORGAN, as we know him, has been cited by the Sokol U.S.A. one of the foremost gymnastic and physical education organizations in the United States. Delegates at the 23d national convention, held in Monessen, Pa., adopted a warm resolution praising Congressman MORGAN for his work as chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, particularly in regard to providing compassionate legislation for immigration to America for thousands of refugees and escapees from the captive nations of Europe. The principal speaker at that convention, incidentally, was another colleague of ours and close friend of mine, the Honorable JOHN H. DENT of Westmoreland County.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the Sokol, which was founded in the United States more than 100 years ago, for singling out "Doc" MORGAN for this special tribute and I take great pleasure in calling the attention of other colleagues in the House to the following Sokol resolution:

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

Be it resolved that the convening body of this 1970 National Convention of the SOKOL-USA unanimously recognize and pay tribute to the Honorable Dr. Thomas E. Morgan, Member of the U.S. House of Representatives from the 26th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

During the post war years Congressman Morgan personally and unrelentingly used the powers of his office to locate and establish communication with American Slovak families and their relatives in Czechoslovakia.

It was the leadership and the thoughtfulness of our friend Congressman Thomas E. Morgan that pressed the free world to be concerned for the welfare of the proud people of Czechoslovakia and other war torn nations of Europe.

It has been through the efforts of Congressman Morgan that much of the progress in visa and passport legislation has been made possible.

Congressman Morgan for more than a quarter of a century in the U.S. Congress has given his leadership and tireless efforts to providing compassionate legislation for immigration to America for thousands of refugees and escapees from the captive nations of Europe.

As Chairman of the powerful and prestigious House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman Thomas E. Morgan continues to represent the true image of America—the image that brought so many of us and so many of our families to America and the privileges of freedom and democracy.

Therefore, let it be known that this convening body of the SOKOL expresses its deep appreciation for the guidance and affection given to our people by the Honorable Dr. Thomas E. Morgan.

DR. ALBERT TOMASULO

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of concern among those who are dedicated to the best possible hospital services for the veterans of our country about the transfer by the Veterans' Administration of Dr. Albert Tomasulo, who has been head of the veterans hospital in Miami. The Honorable JAMES A. HALEY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the House Veterans Committee has called upon the Veterans' Administration for a report on the transfer of Dr. Tomasulo.

Many citizens have written me about the splendid service Dr. Tomasulo rendered to the veterans when he headed the hospital in Miami. He is a man of deep dedication to the cause of the veterans and strove in every way possible to see to it that the veterans got the best possible care. I do not want to pass judgment on the cause for Dr. Tomasulo's transfer until the able House Veterans Subcommittee on Hospitals has a report or findings about the matter. Of course, Congress could not and would not tolerate any member of a veterans hospital staff being transferred because he gave factual information about the quality of care rendered in a veterans hospital.

Mr. Hal Bergida, one of those concerned about Dr. Tomasulo's transfer, wrote about it in his column in the Miami Review of June 24, 1970. Mr. Speaker, I request that Mr. Bergida's remarks be inserted in the RECORD immediately following my remarks:

DR. ALBERT TOMASULO

(By Hal Bergida)

Dr. Albert Tomasulo has been transferred to a beat in the far distant suburbs for telling the truth about the Veterans Administration and its hospital here. In typical immature, vicious and childish action the administrators of the VA have ordered the outspoken Tomasulo to the small installation at Bath, N.Y. You can be sure that when they replace him here it will be with a new director of the stripe that they like—formally official, close-mouthed, and more concerned about his job than the patients under his care. There aren't many 24-year veterans of the VA system with the courage Dr. Tomasulo showed in appearing before the House Veterans Affairs Hospital Subcommittee and telling them what the VA hospital system is really like.

The time is long overdue for a complete shakeup of the care given our veterans. Their broken bodies and minds do not belong in the hands of mean little bureaucrats and penny-pinching budget department scrooges. They have given of themselves and they now deserve the best that this nation can give them in return. Instead of pushing Dr. Tomasulo off to a small-town Siberia he should be kept here as a shining example of one decent administrator who had the courage to speak out for the benefit of the patients entrusted to him.

While the Congress is busy with wars in Asia, the many problems here at home and a possible summer adjournment, you would think that it still could find time to look after the Tomasulo's, not just for his problem in being transferred but in defense of what he has come to stand for in this matter of caring for those who cared enough to sacrifice for us. The time is long past due for the members of the Congress to step into the running of the VA system and give it a good housecleaning.

THE SQUEAKY WHEEL GETS THE GREASE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, last week the House passed H.R. 279, the so-called Newspaper Preservation Act. In so doing they demonstrated once again that if an industry screams "wolf" loud enough, there are plenty who will rush to its rescue without first checking the validity of these cries.

Nicholas von Hoffman's July 13 column in the Washington Post effectively outlines that it is indeed the squeaky wheel that gets the grease. At this point I include excerpts from Mr. von Hoffman's article in the RECORD:

NEWSPAPER MONOPOLIES

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

Last Wednesday, the day the House of Representatives voted to exempt the newspaper industry from the antitrust laws, you

could see Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird out on the floor throwing handshakes and athlete's hugs at his old congressional buddies. It may have been a social call he was paying, or he may have been lobbying for a spare aircraft carrier, but whatever the reason for his presence this busy man had found time to talk to congressmen.

Spiro T. ("Ted") Agnew was not present, was not shaking legislative hands, was not lobbying against this bill which furthers the media concentration that our esteemed Vice President would have people think he objects to. The bill will make it legal for 44 newspapers in 22 cities to rig prices, divide markets and pool profits in the grand tradition of John D. Rockefeller the first. It will also permit any and all other newspapers to apply to the Justice Department for permission to do the same in the future.

The 44 newspapers which receive immediate permission to ignore the law that others must obey have been granted this privilege on the grounds that without it they will fail. The precedent is set; if business is bad, ask Congress to exempt you from free enterprise competition so you can enter into an agreement with your erstwhile commercial rivals to screw the consumer.

If the precedent holds you won't have to be going into bankruptcy, you'll only have to go poor mouth and make it seem that you are. That's what these newspaper scalawags have done: made a loud noise about how poor they and their industry are.

Newspapers are not going out of business. There were, according to the testimony on this bill, 1,749 newspapers in America at the close of World War II. Twenty years later there were 1,754. During that time daily newspaper sales have grown by more than 10 million. And the advertising revenues? Up more than 400 per cent in the last generation so that last year they went over the \$5 billion mark. New dailies are being started quite regularly, 33 in the past three years. This is not a moribund industry deserving special favors.

The case for the 44 newspapers which wanted this law because they've been operating with price fixing agreements is even shakier. Three of the beneficiaries of this legislative gratuity are The Birmingham Post-Herald, the Pittsburgh Press and the Evansville Press, owned by the Scripps-Howard organization which also owns 15 other newspapers, United Press International, United Features Syndicate, the Newspaper Enterprise Association (NEA), the World Almanac, five television stations and heavy investments in cable TV.

Another outfit that will directly profit from this law is the Newhouse newspaper chain which, according to testimony before the Senate's Antitrust Subcommittee, owns or has a heavy interest in at least eight newspapers and seven television stations. It's sometimes hard to be sure; the skein of corporate control can be so complex. In any event, Newhouse also has seven cable television companies, as well as Vogue, Mademoiselle, House & Garden, Glamour and Bride's magazines.

Other winners under this law are Hearst's many enterprises and John Knight's communications chain which reported first quarter revenues of over \$60 million. If these are deserving candidates for exemption from the antimonopoly laws then what about dear, little DuPont and frail, fading General Electric?

Witnesses before the House committee which reported this monstrosity out onto the floor demonstrated that these collusive agreements cost us consumers not only in dollars but in a lower quality product. After the San Francisco Examiner and Chronicle got together to fix prices, advertising costs in

the Chronicle nearly doubled. Beyond that, the newspapers were able to offer two-for-the-price-of-one advertising deals that drove a new, competitive daily out of town.

Although the bill's purpose is to save financially dying newspapers and promote news and editorial diversity, the truth is the Chronicle had \$7 million in the bank when it signed its agreement with its competitor. Moreover, the quality of local news coverage in both papers has become so bad that the best and most reliable periodical in the city is The Bay Guardian, a monthly put out by one man and a bunch of volunteer helpers.

The greatest shame here isn't Agnew's or Congress's but the newspapers'. In their rectitude, they denounce everybody else's circumvention of the give and take of the free market. By forcing this piece of tacky legislation through, they've shown they're just as scurvy as the special interests they love to denounce.

There are some noble, ironic exceptions to this, the most conspicuous being The New Times which, unlike the Vice President, has spoken out against this new development in media concentration. (The Washington Post also editorialized against the Act.) Even the Justice Department, which doesn't do much right, fought it. But many newspapers have backed it or been silent. That will put them in a strange position when the printers' unions demand they be paid for the work machines do better and faster. If the publishers can violate the principles of free enterprise and live by legalized monopoly, why shouldn't the unions be just as economically irrational?

The papers will not only regret what they've done at the labor bargaining table but also in their dealings with the government. How free are they going to be when they are beholden to these same politicians for their abnormal profits? What they have done to themselves is far worse and far more worrisome than anything Agnew can do to them. Now they must live under the threat that this privilege may be taken away from them.

Perhaps the people in the newspaper industry can take some comfort in the fact that this vote showed that for a dying business they have awesome power. Members of the House of Representatives fought each other for a chance to vote for this bill, which wars against both liberal and conservative principles.

Only 87 congressmen had the guts to vote no. One of them was the black lady, liberal-radical from Bedford Stuyvesant, Shirley Chisholm, and another was John Rousselot, the John Birch Society man from Orange County, California. So who says the extremes can't unite in America? The problem is what do we do about the soggy middle?

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

WHAT'S RIGHT ABOUT AMERICA

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, Rev. Karl E. Olson, minister of the Fremont Congregational Church, sent me a copy of his July 5 sermon on "What's Right About America." It is one of the finest statements on the meaning of America that I have read in many months. There being no objection, I am entering it in the RECORD so that Reverend Olson's message may have the widest possible audience:

"WHAT'S RIGHT ABOUT AMERICA"

An Independence Day sermon on July 5, 1970 at the Fremont Congregational Church (United Church of Christ), Fremont, California by the Reverend Karl E. Olson.

"Proclaim liberty throughout the land, to all the inhabitants thereof!"—Lev. 25:10

I love America! And because this Independence Sunday falls in a year when patriotism is being so hotly debated, it may be appropriate to share with you some personal thoughts on why I love my country. During the Talk-Back you may wish to share some of your own ideas on the same subject. And I am particularly happy this morning to declare some of my very affirmative and constructive feelings about America for I fear there may be some in America and even in this community who question the patriotism of persons who oppose certain governmental policies, and heaven knows that some of us have been cast into a seemingly negative role in recent years, much to our own dismay. Be that as it may, this morning I want to say a good word, many good words, about our nation.

I

Undoubtedly the first reason I, and surely many of you, love our country is the simple fact that it is our own. Most folks have a certain basic patriotism that holds regardless of the country's geography, economy, or type of government. They love it because it is familiar turf. Millions of Germans, for instance, fought for the Third Reich not because they were Nazis, agreed with Hitler, or hated the Jews or the Allies, but simply because Germany was their country, and they loved the Fatherland. Perhaps it is akin to the love many of us retain for the states from which we have come. These are places of memory and association. I still love the State of Michigan. Other things being equal I prefer to stay in California, but I still root for the Tigers! Last week when thousands of Italian-Americans staged a huge rally in New York City, one of the demonstrators carried a sign which read: "Italy—Love it and Left it!" I hope the time never comes when any of us will feel we have to leave America; but if we ever should, I'm sure we will still love it.

II

In addition to this rather accidental reason (the accident of birth) for being patriotic, I'd like to share some fundamental convictions about what is right about America. The first thing that's right is a long story, but I'll try to keep it brief. 194 years ago yesterday they rang a bell in Philadelphia, and on it you can still see the words boldly inscribed: "Proclaim liberty throughout the land, unto all the inhabitants!" That quotation wasn't from Thomas Jefferson or Benjamin Franklin, but from the Biblical book

of Leviticus. And what an appropriate quotation it was, for it implied a certain parallel between ancient Israel and Eighteenth Century America.

Freedom-loving Israelites, perhaps as much as 18 centuries before Christ, left their homeland during a devastating drought and took temporary refuge in the fertile and prosperous Nile Valley. Egypt welcomed these industrious foreigners, so they stayed on for many generations. But with the passing of the years their lot became progressively more difficult. Many of them were reduced to the status of slaves. Freedom lost, they were forced to do the bidding of their masters and of the Pharaoh. But there still burned in their hearts the conviction that God called them to be free. They bided their time until at last there arose a great leader, Moses, who sparked a revolt and led his people in an exodus to freedom. This event remains to this day the central fact of all Jewish history and faith.

On reaching the Promised Land they settled down and began to prosper, at least many of them did. Their flocks multiplied, vineyards and trees bore good fruit, and fields yielded plentiful harvests. But there were always some upon whom fortune did not smile. When such were hard up they would borrow from the more prosperous. But the custom developed that if a man could not repay his debt he became the slave of his creditor, having mortgaged his freedom. And not only the debtor, but his wife and children as well. Once he became a slave there was virtually no way to regain his freedom, either for him or his descendants.

And so, according to the Leviticus account, the righteous and just God of Israel declared every 50 years to be a time of Jubilee. Trumpets were to be blown in every city and hamlet; debts were to be forgiven, land was to be restored, and all slaves were to be set free. "Proclaim liberty throughout the land," saith the Lord. He declared that slavery and subjugation were alien to His holy ways. That as He had given the nation freedom from bondage in Egypt, so was He now giving freedom to individuals.

This message was not lost on the architects of American independence. As they read their Bibles and used the good minds God had given them, they were convinced that God still desired man to be free. Indeed, that God had created man a free creature with such fundamental and inalienable rights (not privileges to be given or taken away) as life, liberty, and the quest for happiness. Further, that the sole excuse for the existence of government was to aid men in securing these rights. And, finally, if any particular government should prove a hindrance rather than a help in securing these blessings, it was both the right and duty of people to revolt and institute such new rule as would more nearly assist them in securing what God intended them to have. And that the legitimacy of a new government would rest not on any divine right of rulers, but upon the consent of the governed.

Such a conviction, spelled out in the Declaration of Independence, was the most radical doctrine of government in the history of mankind when it was written, and still is. If any of us were to attempt to spell out the fundamental basis for government, the chances are we couldn't come within a country mile of anything so inspired as that which Jefferson wrote and the Founding Fathers adopted back in 1776. From that basic document, and the convictions which underlay it, there has ensued the Constitution, Bill of Rights, and the whole American tradition of democratic and representative government. I wouldn't trade it for all the tea in China or gold in South Africa! This is the first and most fundamental thing that is right about

America. To be true to the spirit of those original patriots we must everlastingly struggle to improve our democracy and enlarge the area of man's freedom.

III

Another thing that's right about America, to my mind, is really an accident to history. It just so happens that the United States is about as beautiful, varied, and interesting a country as exists on the face of the globe. Katherine Lee Bates, a Congregational Sunday School teacher, really described it, didn't she, when she wrote "Oh beautiful for spacious skies, for amber waves of grain, for purple mountain majesties above the fruited plain . . ." Not only from "the redwood forests to the gulfstream waters", but from the rockbound coast of Maine to the coral shores of Guam, the tropic climes of the Caribbean to the arctic tundra of Alaska—what an immense and incomparable country! Its lakes and streams, forests and fields, mountains and meadows, deserts and valleys and cities and hamlets, truly a place that's right. And if we've so smogged the air that at times we can't even see our own Mission Peak, then that's our fault, not God's, and He's depending on us to put it right.

A third thing we appreciate about America is the opportunity it has afforded many of us to live "the good life," with material abundance and prosperity. Indeed, it was this very fact that originally brought many settlers to our shores. And, again, much of our prosperity is really due to a couple of accidents of history to which we have fortunately fallen heir. First of course was the unrivalled natural wealth of this particular piece of real estate between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. When the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock they were entering a land of such fertile soil, bountiful game, and endless forests as they could scarcely imagine. An earth that would yield such gold and silver and iron and copper and coal and gas and oil as Europe had never known. And, second, those who first came to these shores, and by and large those who have followed them in the 3½ centuries since, have been intelligent, industrious, and courageous folk. The ones with gumption enough to sacrifice today for the sake of a better tomorrow. Given these kinds of folk, and this kind of natural resource, America could hardly have missed developing into a rich and prosperous country, whatever her form of government or economics. We still have a long way to go before our material prosperity is available equally to all, but given the incentive to do so, we have the means available to accomplish this purpose.

V

Still another important thing that's right about our country is our capacity for correction, progress, and improvement. We are not a nation which worships the status quo; rather, we have the ability and often the inclination constantly to seek improvement. Today, for instance, race is literally a burning issue. Things are not right for the black man, or the brown or yellow or red. But we must also bear in mind that they were once much worse. A time, for instance, when black men were lynched: literally taken away by mobs without a hearing or trial, and hanged from the nearest tree. Not just occasionally, but as often as once a week, somewhere in America. When? During the whole 70-year period of American history from the end of Reconstruction until 1950! 3,500 black Americans lynched in cold blood! We have progressed. Or, again, in the securing of political rights: as late as 1940 only 250,000 black citizens in the southern states were enfranchised to vote; in 30 years that number has increased twelve-fold. And with the greater franchise has come an immeasurable

improvement in the opportunities for employment, education, and justice. We've come a long way. But we also have to remember, like the '49ers in the Nevada desert bound for California, if we stop now all is lost! They had the capacity to keep going 'til they reached their goal, and so do we; that's another of the "right things" about America. And not only in race relations but in every facet of our national life. What progress we have made in education, health, and concern for human welfare! The moral sensitivities of our people, combined with the democratic form of our government, have given us a natural penchant for progress and continual correction.

VI

The final "right thing" about America I have time to touch on today, and one of fundamental importance, is the fact that we are basically a peace-loving, a pacifistic people. Our nation, at least during much of its history, has been singularly free from the curse of militarism. We have had our lapses, of course: witness our subjugation of the Indians, our conquest of the Southwest, our involvement in the lands to the south of us. Yet by and large we have stood unique among the powers of the earth for our lack of militarism, for our peaceful relations with other peoples. This, too, was a powerful incentive for immigration to America. Peace-loving folks were naturally drawn to a land where military service was voluntary, not compulsory. In the whole history of our nation not a single man was ever drafted into peacetime military service until I was in theological seminary! This is the peace-loving America I love, and which I think still exists in the hearts of the silent majority of Americans. The free land to which men came who would not be subjugated to the conscription of a Bismarck or Czar, or even of democratic rulers. The policy of peace has historically been one of our proudest boasts. And it is right. Today it is both ironic and tragic that those who would practice this time-honored American virtue find their patriotism impugned, their loyalty questioned.

Rather might we question this recent change in direction which says we must maintain armed forces around the world, be prepared to pulverize any nation on earth, should use our armed strength to intimidate others into following our policies, that only by increasing our "defense" spending will we maintain prosperity, that top military brass should effectively control our foreign policy, that reversion to voluntary recruitment would somehow lay us open to dictatorship, and that three-quarters of all our federal spending should go for war.

This latter is the only America our youth have ever known. And if many of them don't like it, are struggling against it, we should recognize that at least they are in basic accord with the time-honored traditions of the peaceful America others of us still remember; that they are basically in revolt not against the nation, but against some of its policies. The America I love, which I hope you love, and which I think our youth dream of loving, is the America of compassion, not coercion; of friendship, not force; of peace, not pugnacity.

This, too, is one of the great things about America and her people. We will not let the militarist-minded hardhats claim our flag as their sole monopoly. For the flag, rightly understood, stands for all that's right in the American system and tradition. It denotes not the practice of lynching, but the Proclamation of Emancipation. It symbolizes the memory of the best that has been, the dream of the best that yet may be. There is much that is right about our nation, that makes us proud to be Americans. Let us ever "proclaim liberty throughout the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof!"

A JUDGE AND THE ESTABLISHMENT

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, Judge Elwin L. Page of Concord, for many years an outstanding member of the supreme court of the Granite State, is famous for many accomplishments not the least of which is an extremely talented son, Robertson Page. Besides being an outstanding musician, banker, and financial counselor, he is also a writer of no mean repute.

Recently there appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald of June 14, 1970, an article by Robertson Page entitled "My Father and the Establishment." Within the context of these remarks is the core of much of the difficulty our Nation has been experiencing of late. Society must have an established order. It is of course subject to change and to improvement. The amendatory process is part of the genius of the Constitution. It is sad that many who deplore and denounce the establishment offer nothing in its place. Society without order is anarchy, no matter how desperately some of the modern protestors long for a condition of untrammelled license.

I believe readers of the RECORD would benefit from the opportunity to review Mr. Page's remarks which follow:

MY FATHER AND THE ESTABLISHMENT

(By Robertson Page)

WILLIAMSTOWN.—Yesterday my father celebrated his 79th reunion at Williams College.

Frail in body, but sturdy in spirit, he returned to the college he has loved for so many years. At the age of 94 he paid his own personal tribute to a past that one is tempted to equate with what is happening in America today.

There was no affluence for Elwin L. Page when he was an undergraduate. He waited on tables, serving the wealthier students in order to secure an education.

There was no time for protest. My father was too busy improving his mind. Moreover, he carried at all times a faith in America.

There was no urge for disruption or violence. He was, and is, a gentle man.

A poor boy who desperately wanted an education, he went on to graduate with honors and a Phi Beta Kappa key and received further distinctions at Harvard Law School.

Seventy years ago he voiced belief in "ecology," long before "S.D.S." discovered the word. As a very young man he was actively engaged in the conservation of our forests, a dedicated supporter of Theodore Roosevelt and John Muir in establishing the National Park Service.

In 1912 he backed the Bull Moose Party, a liberal cause close to his heart as a budding attorney in Concord, N.H.

A belief in what he calls "true liberalism" was a guiding light over the years. As a circuit judge on the Superior Court of New Hampshire he constantly upheld the rights of the voiceless. Later, on the state's Supreme Court, he wrote his proudest opinion, defending members of a religious sect who refused to salute the American flag.

Yet that flag always waved at our home on each national holiday. In his quiet way,

my father taught me respect and affection for our country that always will remain.

Perhaps his firm belief in America arises from a deep knowledge of its history. He is a Lincoln scholar of note and a life-long friend of the late and distinguished F. Lauriston Bullard of the Boston Herald. His written works on Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Washington and New Hampshire's Josiah Bartlett are known in college libraries—those that haven't been burned. He is a well-known member of the Boston "Lincoln Group."

My father has a self-effacing modesty, difficult to find in today's strident pretention. The idea of demanding a voice in running Williams would not have occurred to him, then or now.

At 94, he still practices law at 77 North Main Street in Concord, an address he has maintained since 1910. Stooped over his desk, he devotes pains-taking hours to his clients, inevitably undercharging them. He has always believed in honest work, of giving more than received.

There was always a magic to that number "1900," shared with such pride by members of his class. Like so many others, my father comes to the verdant campus on this June week-end, looks to his favorite mountain—Greylock—and feels, I am sure, a welling nostalgia for days locked in memory.

And what of his life? What inference can be drawn from these 94 years?

Chiefly, that the much maligned "establishment" consists of untold people like him who spent immeasurable personal effort in a search for change. For generations they moulded a nation. Fought and bled for it. Sought to improve it. Revered it.

In their own way, these men and women provided building blocks for future generations. They demonstrated that those with respect for the past—instead of contempt for it—will find a constructive foundation for rebuilding the present.

A soft June twilight settles upon Williams-town this evening. A fading sun penetrates the dusk, glinting briefly on tall and stately oaks.

SMALL PUSH HELPS A SELF-STARTER

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, many programs have been initiated in recent years to promote the cause of equal educational opportunities for disadvantaged youth. In contrast, the adult poor—the group that has suffered longest—has been shamefully neglected. This neglect in at least one instance is now being redressed.

College Fellowships for Mature Adults—CFMA—an organization in the town of North Hempstead, N.Y., has begun an experiment in adult self-help. The organization offers aid to adults who have been forced into futureless jobs by economic necessity and discrimination. CFMA provides both guidance and partial scholarship aid, thus encouraging high school graduates, usually over the age of 25, to seek further education.

During the 1968-69 school year, the organization helped 52 students attend four Long Island colleges on either a full- or part-time basis. CFMA also sponsored a summer course in English for those who needed to perfect their basic language

skills. The group raised \$7,000 in private gifts to supply scholarships for the students, many of whom have families.

To continue to expand this project, more funds—both public and private—are required. I believe all of us are anxious to encourage a program in which professional volunteers, educational institutions, and ambitious, hard-working adults are cooperating enthusiastically to improve our human resources.

College Fellowships for Mature Adults is an excellent example of the social benefit that can result from the combination of private initiative and a genuine concern for the development of individual capabilities. It should serve as a model for the rest of the country, and it is my hope that this experiment is copied across the Nation.

I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Mr. Brad O'Hearn that appeared in Newsday about this program:

SMALL PUSH HELPS A SELF-STARTER

(By Brad O'Hearn)

WESTBURY.—Almost everyone knows someone like George Jackson—somebody who is bright, intelligent and quick to learn but who is stuck in a dead-end job because he does not have enough education.

Now there is a group trying to do something about the George Jacksons. The group known as College Fellowships for Mature Adults, is trying to give an educational boost to persons who have not given up the hope of continuing their education.

The group, made up of North Hempstead Town residents, is simple in design but large in purpose. It seeks out mature adults (generally age 25 or over), encourages them to continue their education and helps them pay for it. Because of fund limitations, the group supplies mainly tuition funds, but it hopes to be able eventually to offer a stipend so that students, most of them married and with families, will not have to work while attending college.

Although the program is not restricted, most of the students are blacks. "We thought the need there was greatest," said Mrs. Mary T. Egginton, a vice president of the group. In seeking its students, the group tries to find persons with an extra bit of humanity, an extra bit of wit—persons like George Jackson.

Jackson, who lives at 21 Second Ave., Westbury, is black, 42, and the father of 11 children. When he was graduated from high school, his family could not afford college. So he went to work. Until two years ago, he commuted every day to Westchester County, where he was a \$165-a-week worker in a film processing plant. He was well-liked, but his prospects for advancement were slim. And then he heard about the college fellowships group.

"I heard about it from a friend of mine," he said, "and I didn't believe it. I don't know why, but I just didn't think it was possible." A short while later, he took a competitive examination with 189 other applicants at Nassau Community College. He placed in the top four.

"College was a wonderful opportunity. I felt that I was capable of college work, and it was a logical step for me to take. I talked with my boss at the time and he wanted me to stay, but he said it was a good opportunity for me. Besides I have 11 kids and one on the way that I have to take care of, and my wife was firmly behind me," Jackson said.

A short while later, Jackson entered Hofstra University's night sessions to study marketing. He has maintained a B average and hopes to finish in about five years. Once there, he met good fortune again. During a conference, an adviser noticed a camera

Jackson was carrying and asked if he was interested in photography. Jackson said that he was, and the adviser promptly got an appointment for him with an executive at Ehrenreich Photo-Optical Industries Inc. in Garden City. Shortly afterward, Jackson was hired as a customer liaison man in the company's instrument division.

Since then, Jackson's academic and business associates have had little but praise for him. Dean Hyman Lichtenstein of Hofstra's evening college said of Jackson, "I'm terribly impressed with him, not only as a student but as a human being. He's an intelligent and sensitive person. He's one of the people I'm putting my money on to make it."

Saul Bernstein, sales manager of Ehrenreich's instrument division, said, "George is the best-liked person among his peers. He'd win any popularity contest around here. And he's got great ability, too. It would be a shame if he didn't have the opportunity to further his education." Oscar G. Heinemann, a vice president in the firm, said, "It's simple. We love success stories. It's a hangup of this firm."

Jackson is one of 52 adults being helped in varying financial degrees by the North Shore group. He receives \$300 each semester for tuition from the organization. Other participants attend Hofstra, C. W. Post, Nassau Community College, Adelphi and the State Agricultural and Technical College at Farmingdale. The group has obtained a small grant from a foundation and has supplemented that with donations. It hopes to obtain more foundation support to enable it to grant fellowships.

The change in outlook that such a group can bring about can be seen in Jackson. "I had always thought of sending my (five) boys to college, but now I hope to be able to send the girls too. Who knows? Maybe some of them will be going to college with me," he said.

BILINGUAL SOIL CONSERVATION PLAN

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I had the honor to participate in the presentation of the first soil conservation plan in English and Spanish to Horacio Salinas, of La Joya, Tex. For the benefit of my colleagues and all those interested, I will respectfully submit my remarks.

My friends, I am very happy to be here today for many reasons. When I was first invited to participate in this program I accepted immediately because of my interest in agriculture, because of my position on the House Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives, because of my interest in conservation and the Soil Conservation Service, but the main reason I accepted was because of Horacio Salinas.

You see, when you invited me, you did not know of my association with Horacio. He was a friend of my grandfather, he is a friend of my father, and I am proud to say he is my friend. Since I was very young I remember him; he is what many people fear is a disappearing type.

You see, Horacio is not a highly educated man, but he is an honest man; to this day his word is his bond and a hand-

shake will seal any contract he makes. He loves this land and he cares for it. He might not be able to give you the scientific reasons, but he knows when the land is tired, he can tell when it thirsts; oh, he knows this land like he knows his own body and its needs and its wants.

That is why I was so happy that this first conservation plan in English and Spanish was made for Horacio Salinas. He is typical of so many of our farmers, and I am happy that the Soil Conservation Service—let me say our Government, through the Soil Conservation Service—saw a need and moved to fill this need.

There is some question though as to who did not understand whom, because I said Horacio did not understand the soil conservation people, but Horacio tells me it is the other way around. They did not understand him. But now we have our plan in English and Spanish and everyone now understands everyone else.

You know there is a lot of talk these days about improving our environment and we have seen here today how a farmer can take his land and improve it for a better living for himself and to produce good food, clothing, and shelter for others.

Horacio represents one of 1.4 million people in this great State whose main language is Spanish. Many of them own farms, and many others make their livelihood by working in the State's agricultural industry.

The influence of these people on the culture and economy of Texas is tremendous—reaching far beyond their numbers. Nearly all housewives prize our recipes. The houses reflect our architecture in subdivisions everywhere, and some of the most popular music has a definite Latin beat. So it is a satisfaction to me to know that farmers like Horacio, here, have a real influence on our natural resources.

I wonder if the average person realizes how much progress has been made by conservation farmers like Horacio over the years—progress made by free people voluntarily participating in a democratic program? Horacio is one of about 190,000 Texas landowners who have made conservation plans through their soil and water conservation districts.

These farmers have installed conservation work on 2.5 million acres of cropland to conserve and stretch our water supply. They have converted nearly 3 million acres of cropland, much of it the kind that causes erosion problems, into good grassland. Last year alone, Texas conservation district cooperators built 42 million feet of terraces to conserve soil, water, and fertilizer on sloping cropland.

Benefits of all this work are not just for the farmer. When Horacio returns the stalks, stems, and leaves of his crops to the soil, the land is protected, more water soaks in, less erosion takes place. Flooding and stream pollution are reduced. Dust is not blown from his fields to mess up living room furniture in homes far away. His wise use of soil and water helps assure us of food for ourselves and our children. The improved

grazing land means meat on the table for people who never heard of Horacio Salinas.

This plan of Horacio's is a good example of how democratic action helps us all.

Texas soil and water conservation districts were made possible by State law. Three of the Willacy-Hidalgo directors were elected and two were appointed as the law provided.

These five men, I. B. Ridling, D. V. Guerra, who has served on the Secretary of Agriculture's Public Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation for the past 2 years, Jesse A. Krueger, Thomas H. Rains, and D. B. Shields, Jr., contribute their time and efforts to give overall guidance to the conservation program.

The district and the Soil Conservation Service have an agreement under which the SCS furnishes trained people to help with the district's conservation program.

Chuck Whittle, Jose Gonzalez, and Marian Johnson of SCS are a hard-working bunch. These men get out with their feet in the dirt to help our people—they have visited Horacio's farm many times to survey conservation work and to counsel with him on his range management. They have been a great service to the farmers of my district.

Today the Willacy-Hidalgo soil and water conservation district and the Soil Conservation Service once again prove that they mean to be of the most possible service to the people they work with.

For some time, district and SCS folks have been working on ways to better serve the Spanish-speaking people of the State. You have heard conservation radio messages over Spanish-language stations in Weslaco, Mission, Laredo, and Harlingen. Throughout Texas, there are 32 radio stations and four television stations that are donating time to conservation messages in Spanish.

The SCS carries out a program of training to help its employees explain conservation work and its benefits in Spanish. This has already been of great help in this area. Meetings and tours are sometimes held in Spanish.

All of this is leading up to a first for the Willacy-Hidalgo district—Horacio's conservation plan is the first in Texas to be prepared in Spanish. This has been a lengthy project, because of the need to translate technical terms. But with the hard part over now, Ed Thomas, from the State CSC office, assures me that there will be many more plans in Spanish.

These conservation plans mean more jobs, better income, cleaner water, and more opportunity for our children. I recommend to those who have not availed themselves of the opportunity to prepare a conservation plan to get in touch with the district office without delay. And, Mr. Thomas, please take this message to Mr. Clyde Graham, my good friend, the State conservationist—I think the efforts of the SCS to overcome language difficulties show a dedication to helping all the citizens of Texas. I extend to you the ap-

preciation of the Spanish-speaking people of the 15th Congressional District, and I hope that the spirit of helpful cooperation will always rule between us.

HEALTH MANPOWER EDUCATION

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the funding crisis in health manpower education deepens every day.

For the information of my colleagues, I insert into the RECORD a series of press and journal accounts relating to the financial problems of medical schools. These include:

A story in the Washington Post, Saturday, June 20, 1970, entitled "Disaster Aid Given Schools of Medicine." This story identifies the following institutions as having been awarded special project grants from NIH on the basis of financial distress: St. Louis, New York Medical College, Loyola/Stritch, Arizona, Arkansas, Boston, California/Irvine, Howard, Loma Linda, Miami, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Northwestern, Puerto Rico, Temple, Tennessee, Tulane, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia, Wayne State, Albany, Chicago, Georgia, Hahnemann, Jefferson, Meharry, Mount Sinai, and the four osteopathic colleges in Chicago, Kansas City, Kirksville, and Ohio.

Two stories from the Baltimore Sun: "Federal Aid Cuts Threaten Nation's Medical Schools" and "Some Medical Schools Facing Closure." The latter story reports on the problems at St. Louis University, George Washington, and Case Western Reserve University in detail and identified Albert Einstein, New York Medical College, Loyola, Tulane, Bowman Gray, Cornell, Tufts, and Johns Hopkins as other schools in serious financial distress.

New York Times story of Sunday, June 21, 1970, entitled "Medical Schools Are in Deep Trouble." This story notes, among other things, the failure of voters in California to support a multimillion-dollar bond issue, in support of expansion of State medical facilities.

Wall Street Journal story of March 16, 1970, entitled "Money Problems Force Med School Cutbacks." This story is more descriptive of the basis of the financial problems facing medical schools.

Extensive article from the Medical News section of the Journal of American Medical Association for June 8, 1970, entitled "101 Medical Schools/Pressures Grow While the Foundations Crumble." This story provides an extensive review of the problems of specific schools.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, June 20, 1970]

"DISASTER" AID GIVEN SCHOOLS OF MEDICINE

(By Victor Cohn)

Forty-three of the country's 107 medical schools are in such severe economic danger that they are getting "financial distress" grants from the government.

The funds currently total \$15 million, an average of nearly \$349,000 per school.

"What we're giving them are disaster grants," explained Dr. Robert Q. Marston, director of the National Institutes of Health.

Deans of Loyola University's Stritch Medical College outside Chicago and St. Louis University Medical School say they may not be able to stay open "more than another year" without substantial new help.

"St. Louis University is eating endowments which have been its life blood for years," Dr. Robert Felix, medical dean, reported. "You get down to where you're eating your own flesh."

Among other medical schools in severe trouble (some authorities give them "three to five years") are those at Tufts University in Boston; New York Medical College; Bowman-Gray (Winston-Salem, N.C.), Creighton University (Omaha) and Women's (Philadelphia) Medical Colleges.

Georgetown and George Washington University's schools are in the same group. They are planning a joint appeal to Congress for an annual subsidy for each student, on the lines of subsidies recently voted by Illinois, Texas, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Florida and New York legislatures for even private schools in their states.

These subsidies have rescued Case-Western Reserve University Medical School in Cleveland and Marquette University's in Milwaukee from imminent closing, though both are still on the NIH "distress" list.

Not on this list but still in "poor straits," it is reported, are Cornell University and Albert Einstein Medical Colleges in New York and Johns Hopkins in Baltimore.

Many schools have been running annual deficits for about three years. But now the situation is far worse, states Dr. John Cooper, president of the Association of American Medical Colleges.

He has just told both Senate and House Appropriations subcommittees that "the whole financial structure of our medical schools is now gravely threatened," especially that of private, non-state schools.

He attributes the trouble to "our utter failure as a nation to make the M.D. shortage a high priority item."

But, specifically, medical schools and their teaching hospitals—a large part of their financial problem—have been hit by simultaneous inflation, cuts in federal research and training funds (50 per cent of their entire income in many cases) and cuts in Medicaid payments to some hospitals. And all came during expensive attempts to expand to meet national demands for more doctors and more poor and black students.

"We've just raised our tuition to \$2,250 a year, and that's still only 20 to 25 percent of our cost," said Felix. "We're pricing the poor boy out."

St. Louis University will still have a \$750,000 deficit. Also, Felix said: "We have a crushing need for updated plant. We've been approved for a \$9.5 million federal grant—it's still unfunded. If we don't get it, I believe I must recommend that we not admit another class beyond fall."

His university has already abandoned its school of dentistry (now graduating its last class), engineering and earth sciences and aviation technology.

To meet their deficits—\$1,998,000 this year at George Washington University Medical Center here, some \$500,000 at Georgetown—the medical colleges and their parent schools resort to bank loans, mortgages, land sales and use of precious endowments.

Dean Frederick Eagle at New York Medical College said: "Our budget this year will balance. It has to! We're down to \$200,000 of what was \$2 to \$3 million in unrestricted endowment."

Dr. John Masterson at Loyola's Stritch Medical College is using bank loans to help

meet a \$4,981,000 medical center deficit for the 10 months through April 30.

But many states have laws forbidding such debts. "Any institution that would lend me money, I wouldn't want to have my money in," said Dr. Felix.

"Our capital reserves were completely depleted in 1968-69," reported Dean John Parks at George Washington. "This and next year we'll be going into endowments."

The current \$15 million in federal disaster aid (available either to keep schools from closing or deteriorating, or to maintain class size) comes from \$101.4 million in all what NIH calls "total institutional support." For fiscal 1971, President Nixon's budget asks for \$113.6 million—"appropriate in view of the needs," said one official, "far from enough" in the view of the deans.

Other medical schools getting distress grants are those of Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Boston, California (Irvine), Howard, Loma Linda (Calif.), Miami, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Northwestern, Puerto Rico, Temple, Tennessee, Tulane, Utah, Vermont, Wayne State (Detroit) and West Virginia universities.

Also, Albany, Chicago, Georgia, Hahnemann and Jefferson (both of Philadelphia), Meharry (Nashville) and Mount Sinai (New York City) Medical Colleges. Also four osteopathic colleges: Chicago, Kansas City, Kirksville (Mo.) and Ohio.

[From the Baltimore Sun, June 21, 1970]

CRISIS IN HEALTH—I: FEDERAL AID OUTS THREATEN NATION'S MEDICAL SCHOOLS (By Frederick P. McGehan)

America's medical schools are in serious financial trouble.

At a time when the schools are being pressured to enroll more students and expand community services, they find their income bases shrinking.

CLOSINGS HINTED

As a result of this "crunch," at least one medical school dean has threatened to close his school. Several other deans have hinted at this—if their sources of financial support continue to dwindle.

Some schools have taken stringent economy measures, such as putting freezes on hiring, salary increases and overtime payments—as well as deferring much-needed capital improvements.

And, perhaps most vexing to medical school officials, no one seems to be taking their plight seriously. It may take the closing of one or more schools to make the nation's policy-makers take note of the grave situation, these officials believe.

The Association of American Medical Colleges reports that 61 medical schools—of a total of 107 in the nation—have been awarded special federal grants "on the basis of some condition of financial distress."

HAPHAZARD SUPPORT

The current situation has come about largely as the result of federal outbacks in research and training funds. It has dramatically exposed the haphazard way in which the nation's medical schools have been supported.

After World War II, as the nation's medical and scientific programs began to take quantum jumps, medical schools hopped aboard the gravy train.

The schools' primary goals of teaching medical students and training health professionals became clouded as they fought for federal funds to build research facilities and put together top-flight research teams. In some schools, it has been estimated, as much as 80 percent of faculty salaries were paid out of federal research funds.

Many medical school deans now feel this heavy reliance on "back door" financing was a mistake.

Most observers agree that the 1967-1968

fiscal year was the turning point. Heavy drains on the economy caused by the Vietnam war and the spiraling costs of such programs as Medicare and Medicaid forced a retrenchment in other domestic spending.

The National Institutes of Health—the chief funnel through which research funds flow—was one of the first to feel the budget squeeze.

Despite increasing demands on its resources, the National Institutes of Health has been held to a research budget of just about \$1 billion. To compensate, it has ordered across-the-board cuts—averaging between 4 and 20 percent—in many programs relating to medical schools.

As the flow from the federal spigot was being reduced, the schools were struggling to meet the costs of inflation—which in the medical area are often two and three times the national average of 6 percent a year. And, as in many areas of higher education, the influx of private endowment funds also was on the wane.

Against this onslaught, the medical schools had little defense.

The American Medical Association, the epitome of organized medicine in this country, had opposed for years the direct federal subsidy of medical education. Only in 1968 did it join with the Association of American Medical Colleges to request increased federal support for medical education.

The association of medical colleges also has had trouble in the past marshaling unified support among its constituent public and private schools. Until last year the association was headquartered in Evanston, Ill., far from the halls of Congress and the federal bureaucracy.

With a new Washington office under the direction of Dr. John A. D. Cooper, former dean of the Northwestern University Medical School, the association has begun a vigorous lobbying effort.

In recent testimony before a House appropriations subcommittee, Dr. Cooper outlined clearly the dilemma facing current medical education.

Faced with a cry for 50,000 more physicians in this country, Dr. Cooper said, medical schools have increased their enrollment capacities by 32 percent since 1964.

NOT ENOUGH FUNDS

But, he charged: "...the Executive Branch has never requested sufficient funds nor has the Congress appropriated the amounts required to enable medical schools to launch the kind of swift, head-on and concerted attack that would effectively close the widening gap between supply and demand."

The National Institutes of Health, he noted, has tentatively approved requests for construction of new teaching facilities totaling \$600 million; against this it has only \$118 million to spend in the current fiscal year. This spending is expected to be constant in the next fiscal year, despite an authorized ceiling of \$225 million, he said.

Dr. Cooper found that institutional and special project grants—the only direct federal support of medical school operating costs—have fallen short of the mark. A total of \$264 million has been appropriated since the grants were introduced in 1966, but the authorized ceiling was \$317 million, he said.

"The funds provided to date, of which only 45.7 percent on the average goes to the medical schools, are so inadequate as to thwart completely the chief purposes for which the program was brought into being," he testified.

Federal loan programs for medical students have been sharply reduced, Dr. Cooper told the congressmen. The President's 1971 fiscal budget proposes \$12 million for student loans, less than half the \$26.5 million appropriated in 1969, he said.

"In the past, medical schools have been able to admit the most qualified applicants

regardless of socio-economic backgrounds. Now, schools are being increasingly forced to use another admissions criterion—the ability to pay for one's own education," he said.

[From the Baltimore Sun, June 22, 1970]

CRISIS IN HEALTH—II: SOME MEDICAL SCHOOLS FACING CLOSURE (By Frederick P. McGehan)

St. Louis University School of Medicine is a respectable, 140-year-old institution that may have to close its doors.

The Jesuit-affiliated school has a student enrollment of 540, including about 70 post-doctoral students, and is the hub of a medical center that includes a 300-bed hospital, a mental health center, and schools of nursing and allied health professions.

Like many other medical schools it is straining to increase its enrollment (440 freshmen next year) and to offer opportunities for minority groups (10 black students will be admitted this fall).

It is also attempting to replace its outdated classrooms and laboratories with more modern facilities.

According to Dr. Robert H. Felix, the school's dean, the school was "carrying on fairly well" until it applied for a \$10 million federal construction grant.

In the vicious competition for the dwindling federal dollar, the school was denied the grant, Dr. Felix said.

About the same time, Dr. Felix related in a telephone interview, the university's board of trustees changed from a religious to a lay board.

Faced with severe economic problems throughout the university, the new board decided to close the schools of dentistry, engineering and aviation technology in order to conserve resources for the remaining schools. The medical school will soon begin to occupy space in the former dental school.

ANNUAL DEFICIT

Despite this juggling, Dr. Felix said his school continues to run a \$750,000 annual deficit. "It comes right out of the guts of the treasury of the university," he said.

Dr. Felix said his school has been "hit badly" by reductions in federal research and training grants.

Thirty per cent of some faculty salaries is paid out of these funds, he said. With this source reduced it becomes necessary to take salary money from the school's operating expenses. "If you shift money to salaries, you have to let equipment and supplies go," he noted.

NO ALTERNATIVE

"If they want to cut back on research, give us the funds to keep teaching," the dean lamented. "When you cut funds off on one side and don't replace them, then we're dead," he said.

At this point, Dr. Felix stated, he sees "no alternative" but to recommend to the board of trustees that no freshman class be admitted in the fall of 1971.

"If the medical school closes, then the medical center will close too," Dr. Felix warned.

St. Louis University is perhaps the extreme case. Concerned observers, however, list between 10 and 12 other medical schools that are in serious difficulties.

These include Albert Einstein College of Medicine in New York, New York Medical College, Georgetown and George Washington Universities, both in Washington, Loyola University of Chicago, Tulane University in New Orleans, Bowman-Gray Medical College in Winston-Salem, N.C., Cornell University Medical School, and Tufts University Medical School in Boston.

The Johns Hopkins School of Medicine has also appeared on several lists of ailing schools.

New York Medical College, one of the country's largest medical schools with 511 students, has placed a freeze on new hiring and has placed controls on overtime and wage increases.

It has used up its unrestricted endowment to meet deficits which currently amount to \$2.5 million a year. The school's bank credit has also been limited.

CURTALMENT CONSIDERED

A spokesman for the school said last week that it is considering curtailing some of its community medical programs to meet the financial crisis.

"It's taking everything we can get . . . and we've got just so much baling wire and gum," said the spokesman.

Dr. John Parks, dean of the George Washington University Medical School, said last week that his school's deficit has grown from \$291,000 in 1963-1964 to almost \$2 million for the current fiscal year.

A \$2 million reserve fund the school had built up was spent by the 1967-1968 fiscal year and the school has begun to dip into its endowment. "We haven't gotten to the stage of borrowing against the endowment, but we may," said Dr. Parks.

TREMENDOUS HANDICAP

The dean said that government funds only fill about one-fourth of student scholarship requests. In the past school year, he said, the school was able to provide only \$200,000 out of \$450,000 in aid requested by students.

Dr. Parks said that, because of cutbacks in federal training grants, the school will have to eliminate six postdoctoral fellowships in pharmacology. He termed it a "tremendous handicap" because some of the students had been working for as many as three years.

Most observers agree that private medical schools are in worse shape than state-supported ones. State schools, they argue, are assured of a certain amount of stable support through their state legislatures.

SEEK STATE AID

With their backs to the wall, the private schools have also been calling upon state legislatures for aid.

Legislatures in at least six states—Florida, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio and Wisconsin—have responded by voting aid to private medical schools. Often it takes the form of per capita grants for each medical student.

Case-Western Reserve Medical School in Cleveland was in bad financial shape earlier this year before the Ohio Legislature came through with a two-year, \$3 million direct-support grant.

To keep construction projects going the school had to divert \$12 million from its endowment. It was taking 10 to 15 per cent cuts in federal research and training grants and student scholarship funds were dwindling.

HAD TO LOBBY

Seeing no hope of federal aid, the school went to the state legislature. "We had to lobby the state legislature, which was not the easiest thing to do," said Sam Whitman, the school's associate dean for administration.

Mr. Whitman, in a telephone interview, had some tart comments on the lack of federal assistance.

"Medical schools can't sustain a steady erosion year after year in general support, someone in Washington has to sit up and take notice," he said.

"So far I haven't seen any indication that the government is taking this matter seriously," he said in bitter tones.

[From the New York Times, June 21, 1970]

MEDICAL SCHOOLS ARE IN DEEP TROUBLE

(By Harry Schwartz)

In New Jersey early this month legislative action snuffed out Rutgers University's hope

that it might soon have a full four-year medical school. In California a few days earlier, voters defeated a proposed multi-million-dollar bond issue designed to increase substantially the state's medical education facilities. Meanwhile, all over the United States existing medical schools are caught in a deepening financial crisis which has brought some to the edge of bankruptcy.

Ironically these difficulties have appeared at a time when there is almost unanimous agreement that the country needs many more physicians. Complaints of a doctor shortage come from virtually all parts of the nation as the population expands and as Medicare, Medicaid and various forms of private health insurance provide more Americans than ever before with the financial capability to pay for first-class care.

Yet if present trends continue, the possibility arises that the number of M.D. degrees granted annually in this country—almost 8,500 this year—may stabilize or even decline because some medical schools may be forced to shut their doors while others are forced to curtail their expansion plans.

There are now 300,000 active doctors in the United States, a record high. But they are concentrated mainly in the more affluent sections of the nation's metropolitan regions. The doctor shortage is felt most acutely in rural areas and small towns, and in the black, Puerto Rican and Mexican ghettos of the nation's major cities.

A recent report by Dr. John S. Millis of the National Fund for Medical Education spells out the origins of the tightening financial squeeze in which the nation's medical schools, numbering almost 100, and their associated teaching hospitals are now caught.

On the one hand these facilities are under extreme pressure to treat more patients, to take the lead in creating community health centers and other innovative devices for extending good medical care into the ghettos, and to train more health personnel—physicians, nurses, medical technicians, biochemists and other professionals.

But this pressure is coming at a time of rampant inflation when some of the key sources of financial support—notably Federal research funds—are actually declining or at best are not increasing at the rate of rising prices and wages. The impact of the cuts in research funds is particularly severe because about half of all medical school faculty members are supported in part by research grants. The salaries of one-sixth of these faculty members come entirely from such grants.

Both medical educators and politicians are searching frantically for ways out of the present medical school crisis. Ideally, the educators would like to see the problem solved by government and private sources supplying the needed increased funds. Some medical educators speak bitterly about elected government officials who are profligate with their promises of first-class medical care for everyone, but who are extremely niggardly when it comes to providing the needed funds and facilities.

Many medical educators are increasingly depressed by signs of public indifference and of public opposition to giving them the money they feel they need. "I suppose we'll have to wait until a major medical school goes bankrupt and closes its doors before the public wakes up to the realities," one medical educator said last week. It could happen, and not necessarily to only one school.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 16, 1970]

HEALTH CARE CRISIS: MONEY PROBLEMS FORCE MED SCHOOL CUTBACKS OF PROGRAMS, FACULTY

(By James MacGregor)

CLEVELAND.—The medical school at Case Western Reserve University here has a lot of

ambitious projects going. It's pioneering a community health care curriculum, digging into the causes of disease, admitting more blacks, and expanding facilities to double its enrollment by 1972.

But another project is getting top priority these days: An urgent search for money to keep the school going. For—at a time when the nation is seriously short of doctors—Case Western's med school, along with many others across the country, has acute financial problems, and the prognosis is far from encouraging.

Already the school has been forced to close its highly regarded research and treatment center for children's diseases. Dwindling loan and scholarship funds are crippling the black admissions program, and the school has had to divert \$12 million from its endowment fund to keep new construction going. Only an unprecedented \$3 million subsidy from the state of Ohio, says the dean of the school, arrested a crisis that "could have led to closing down altogether within two or three years."

As grim as that sounds, other medical schools have problems as bad or worse. Two prestigious schools, Marquette School of Medicine in Milwaukee and New York Medical College, came perilously close to shutting down this academic year before finding the funds to go on. Officials say 10 to 15 more medical schools are in danger of closing within the next three years. Additional schools are caught in a money squeeze so severe that expansion, of program or physical plant, is out of the question.

HOLDING THE LINE

The squeeze is on, in large measure, because the Federal Government—which had funneled increasing amounts of money to medical schools during most of the 1960s—is leveling off now. Meanwhile, inflation means the schools must pay more and more for faculty, construction and equipment.

In the academic years from 1958-59 to 1967-68, Federal research grants to medical schools rose 436% and other kinds of Federal aid, for example, training grants and operating subsidies rose 643%. In the 1967-68 academic year, Federal aid contributed 53% of the total income for all medical schools; at some schools, the Federal contribution was as much as 80%. The schools become dependent on such help—perhaps too dependent, some feel.

Most schools agree that the latter part of the 1967-68 academic year was when the money squeeze hit. That's partly because by then the Federal Government was having money problems of its own. The Vietnam war was draining away money that might have gone to domestic needs, and the Medicare and Medicaid programs were costing more than originally anticipated. So the Government started tightening up on such things as grants for medical research—a trend that intensified when the Nixon Administration clamped a dollar ceiling on total expenditures in the fiscal 1970 budget.

MAKING THE BEST OF IT

"As long as you have an expenditure ceiling and mandatory activities (which must be financed automatically), there aren't many places you can cut the money from," says Dr. Robert Q. Marston, director of the National Institutes of Health, which administers research grants and some other kinds of aid to medical schools. Dr. Marston agrees that "one could hope for much more" in the current budget, but maintains that "under the circumstances" it still represents "a serious attempt to cope with the problems of the medical schools."

Dr. Marston says he expects most categories of Federal aid to medical schools to increase in the fiscal 1971 budget. But right now, most med school deans seem more concerned about the Health, Education, and Welfare Department bill for the current fis-

cal year, which President Nixon signed this month after vetoing an earlier version as "inflationary."

School officials say the bill falls short of both their needs and what they had been led to believe would be forthcoming. "Health apparently has a low priority with this Administration," asserts Dr. John A. D. Cooper, president of the American Association of Medical Colleges.

Declares Dr. Joseph Merrill, assistant dean of Baylor University College of Medicine in Houston: "We simply cannot respond to the health needs of the nation without any money."

CONSTRUCTION CUTBACKS

HEW officials put the national doctor shortage at 50,000. Even if all the presently planned construction projects were funded and begun at once, the time required to build facilities and train doctors means it would take six to 10 years before the shortage would start easing. But the appropriations bill finally signed by the President allocates \$95 million for construction this year, down from \$100 million last year and considerably short of the \$19 million backlog of projects that HEW has approved.

Funds to aid medical students are also shrinking. Under the fund appropriations bill, loan and scholarship funds for medical students drop to \$17 million this year from \$21 million last year. Dr. Cooper of the American Association of Medical Colleges says the \$17 million is about half the amount needed; he fears the present trend "could eventually preclude medical education for all but the relatively wealthy."

Medical school deans say that no matter how they try to cut costs, the results will be painful. They're reluctant to cut back faculty because they say they're already short-handed. Some are letting researchers and technicians go, well aware of the rule of thumb that it takes 10 years to rebuild a research team once it has been broken up. And the schools often are locked into long-term research contracts that can't be broken, even if Federal money dries up.

Many school officials are reluctant to jeopardize faculty morale by detaching their plight. But Dr. Cooper says at least 10 schools currently are meeting operating expenses by spending their endowments, thus depriving themselves of future endowment income and security for loans and mortgages.

New York Medical College officials have declared a freeze on new hiring and have instituted controls on overtime, wage hikes and repairs, but they don't see how they can cut back on operating hospital or instructional programs. "There's no such thing as leaving off the spare tire in health care or education," says Jackson E. Spears, college chairman. "It's insane to even think of giving anything but the best."

The school's plight is extreme. To meet current obligations, it already has sold all its unrestricted endowment and exhausted its bank credit. This year it has sometimes had trouble meeting its payroll. With 513 medical students, it's one of the nation's larger medical schools, and its 400-bed Flower and Fifth Avenue Hospital provides excellent medical care in New York's Spanish Harlem ghetto. With an operating budget of \$50 million, the school and hospital are running a yearly deficit of \$2.5 million, due largely to mortgage interest costs and incomplete Medicare and Medicaid reimbursement.

It has been suggested the school eliminate its widely praised community affairs department. The department sponsors work on such problems as lead poisoning, malnutrition and drug addiction. It also runs a storefront center in Harlem where people can get references to health care facilities or help in applying for Medicaid. Mr. Spears says this is precisely what medical schools must do

more of and adds, "I'd almost rather see the whole school closed than lose these projects."

The full effects of most school economy moves won't be felt for several years, but a few could have immediate repercussions. The highly regarded burn and shock research and treatment center of New York's Albert Einstein College of Medicine will run out of money at the end of the month, and no help has yet been found. A Government agency last year agreed to continue financing the center for three years, then abruptly canceled the commitment.

The center's director, Dr. Louis Del Guerio, is worried. "If the center closes, desperately injured people will be forced into open hospital wards where they can't always get care as good as we provide," he says.

State-run schools don't face the same financial problems as private schools, but they're feeling the pinch. Says the dean of one Midwest school: "Every year the legislature gives us 5% more than the year before. But we want to start a department of anesthesiology, and we can't get a cent for it. We have a building that's literally falling down, and we can't get a cent to renovate it, either." In Texas, Gov. Preston Smith recently diverted to Medicaid and Welfare payments \$13 million in state funds originally earmarked for medical school construction.

Both public and private schools are turning to fund-raising drives and philanthropists, with mixed results. New York Medical College has sought help from a number of philanthropists, but "no one in the private sector wants to finance deficits," says Thomas Bannon, financial vice president of the college. It's much harder to raise operating funds than money for buildings or endowed professorships, which have some permanency, he says.

But Mt. Sinai School of Medicine, also in New York, has raised \$62 million from private sources (and \$33 million from government sources) in a continuing fund drive. And Marquette School of Medicine kept itself alive through a fund drive in Milwaukee last year. Subsequently, the Wisconsin state legislature approved financial help for the school, whose officials say its operation is now assured through the 1971 academic year if Federal aid continues at present levels.

Some medical schools have eased their plight by enlisting the support of major corporations and foundations. The most spectacular case may be that of little Meharry Medical College in Nashville, Tenn. Four years ago it was on the verge of bankruptcy. Today, it's not only back on its feet but has begun an expansion program it hopes will boost enrollment from the present 450 medical, dental and technical students to 1,500 by 1975.

Meharry, one of two predominantly black medical schools in the nation, achieved its turnaround by pioneering a novel curriculum based on community health programs for Nashville's poor. Dr. Roger Egeberg, Assistant HEW Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, says the program "could bring health care for the poor out of the Dark Ages into the twentieth century." The program drew major grants from a variety of foundations and corporations and landed George Russell, vice chairman of General Motors Corp., as head of its \$88 million fund-raising campaign.

[From the Journal of the American Medical Association, June 8, 1970]

101 MEDICAL SCHOOLS: PRESSURES GROW WHILE THE FOUNDATIONS CRUMBLE

"Riches-to-rags" rumors are becoming almost as much a part of commencement day as congratulations and the Hippocratic Oath.

As memories of the past school year lead to musings about the next, more and more people are beginning to ask which medical

schools may not open in the fall, which prestigious "have" institutions are now revealed as financial "have nots."

At a time when medical schools are being pressed to produce MDs at a faster rate, many institutions apparently have troubles making ends meet. No schools have as yet closed—and none may—but many administrators are sounding the alarm.

The situation has become so serious at some places that the physician's annual donation will no longer be enough. His alma mater may need active support in trying to effect basic changes in the mechanisms of financing medical education.

Efforts to recruit the physician may appeal to his idealism. "The physician should feel responsible for the machinery which replicates him," said one dean.

Another administrator put things on a more practical level. "The presence of other good physicians in the community increases the satisfaction that a practitioner gets from his practice of medicine. If he does not become concerned with the problems of the medical schools, he may find himself spending more time correcting the mistakes of others."

In order to unravel the complexities of these fiscal problems, Medical News talked to administrators and faculty members, government officials, and medical school analysts. The following stories and photographs by associate editor Steve Murata describe the tightness of the current crunch, reveal some of the underlying reasons, and discuss a few of the possible solutions of the plight of the schools.

SCHOOL YEAR ENDS AMID WORRIES OVER FUTURE

It's difficult to get an exact picture of the tightness of the funding squeeze being felt by the country's 101 medical schools. Many school officials as well as outside experts are close-mouthed when it comes to discussing details.

"There is a natural reluctance for medical schools to reveal their troubles," says Joseph Murtaugh, director of the Department of Planning and Policy Development in the Association of American Medical Colleges (AAMC). Former director of program planning and evaluation for the National Institutes of Health, Mr. Murtaugh also emphasized that many schools are apprehensive of being forced into detrimental actions by boards of trustees, state governments, or other controlling agencies implementing "simplistic solutions."

Moreover, many medical schools have only recently begun to develop administrative staffs and business offices separate from their parent universities. "Some medical schools have difficulty distributing their costs among the educational, research, and service functions," said Mr. Murtaugh.

"Above all, you don't want to get a losing image," noted one school's financial advisor. "Such a reputation makes it difficult to recruit faculty and drives away funds," he said. "Alumni and foundations are happy to endow chairs or new buildings, but they don't like the idea that their donations will be going to support a deficit."

William G. Anlyan, M.D., vice-president for health affairs at Duke University and 1970-1971 chairman of the AAMC's executive council, told MEDICAL NEWS that one-third and possibly one-half of the medical schools in the nation are experiencing severe financial shortages.

AAMC's Mr. Murtaugh also pointed out that more than 30 schools have formally applied for financial assistance from the government.

In a nationally televised news program, Dean Robert H. Felix, M.D., estimated that a dozen medical schools including his own St. Louis University School of Medicine may have to close their doors.

Senator Jacob Javits (Rep. NY) proclaimed that the New York Medical College, New York University's School of Medicine, and the Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University were "facing an acute financial crisis which is threatening their very survival."

Such medical schools as Johns Hopkins, Marquette, Baylor, Temple, Case Western Reserve, and the University of Chicago have also been identified in news stories as having financial woes.

Tulane University's School of Medicine is not in danger of closing, according to Dean Robert D. Sparks, M.D. "The University is committed to keeping the doors open," he said.

However, Dr. Sparks is battling a deficit that reached about \$1.5 million last year. When combined with the School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine, the medical school deficit is expected to reach \$2 million for the 1969-1970 academic year.

Tulane has maintained a reputation as having a strong but balanced program in both education and research. Although placing in the top 20% of the country's medical schools for the number of students graduated each year, Tulane's annual budget remains close to the national median operating expenditure of \$11.6 million (*JAMA* 210:1488 [Nov. 24] 1969).

Some of Tulane's problems are unique. However, many of its difficulties are the same as those troubling other medical schools, particularly the other private institutions which constitute roughly half of the medical education system.

Although these problems are highly complicated, a visit to Tulane leaves one over-riding impression—the medical school in New Orleans is deeply involved in reassessment and evaluation of current operations and future courses.

"Medical education today is undergoing more constructive self-examination than it has since the Flexner report of 1910 and more than is going on in any other field of higher education," said the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in its 1968 report.

FISCAL PROBLEMS THREATEN MEDICAL SCHOOLS

When Abraham Flexner visited Tulane in 1910, he found an institution already organized along the scientific lines he championed. "The medical department of Tulane University is one of a very few existing southern schools that deserves development," reported Mr. Flexner in his famous report. "Its recent reorganization has put imported men of modern training and ideals in charge of the most important departments, laboratory and clinical. There is no question that if properly supported, they will quickly bring the institution to a position of commanding influence."

In his report, Mr. Flexner also noted that the annual expenses have now soared 120 times.

Medical education at Tulane as well as at other schools across the country has become big business, so big that the grand total expended by medical schools in 1967-1968 exceeded \$1.1 billion, according to the AAMC report.

In part, the expenses have risen because of inflation and a small increase in the number of undergraduate medical students. Despite rising fees, tuition has never been able to pay the costs of keeping a medical school open.

Even in 1910, Mr. Flexner complained that "institutions which have always, or long, operated on a high standard, and thus command an established public, find that expense tends to increase more rapidly than fee income."

While earnings from university endowments used to cover the losses in many private schools, the income from this source has not kept pace with inflation. The turndown

in business profits and a 300-point slide in the Dow-Jones Industrial averages during the last year and a half have further diminished endowment earnings.

Although most of Tulane University's 51 million endowment is invested in stocks, bonds, and real estate, the income from this source is decreasing in relation to the school's total budget, according to Mr. Lawrence Gulchard, business manager for the school of medicine.

"Ten years ago, the endowment provided 25% to 30% of the operating funds for the medical school," he said. "Today, earnings from the endowment furnish only 7% to 10% of our income, and we are now having to spend some of the principal to cover the deficit."

Medical schools have added to their own expenses by taking on increased responsibilities, especially in the training of interns and residents. Roughly half of the "student body" now in the nation's medical schools consists of interns, residents and other post-graduate trainees, according to a survey conducted by the NIH. Just recently, more than half of the internships offered were in hospitals affiliated with medical schools according to the AAMC.

"During the last 20 years, the training of interns and residents has become a major portion of the effort of the medical school," says Hayden C. Nicholson, M.D., director of the Department of Undergraduate Medical Education for the American Medical Association.

"While this trend is probably good in terms of the quality of training, you must remember that house staffs do not pay tuition," said Dr. Nicholson in an interview. "Although they are not paid any princely sums for their work, the fact that interns and residents are simply no longer contributing money to support their teachers places additional strain on the schools' financial structures."

More faculty members have been hired in order to provide the close supervision needed by these graduate students and the additional salaries can run into big money. The same NIH survey revealed that twice as many clinical faculty members were needed for residents as for undergraduate medical students. The faculty-to-intern ratio stood at three teachers to every "student."

About 260 resident and 50 interns are training in Tulane services at Charity Hospital or in 10 other New Orleans hospitals loosely associated with the school. "The greatest cost in these programs is the time of the faculty members needed to supervise the work," said Dean Sparks. "While affiliated internships and residencies are a good idea from the training standpoint, they are not so good from the standpoint of money."

Another factor contributing to fiscal problems has been a lack of financial planning as the schools ballooned in size. Profit-and-loss accounting techniques common in manufacturing or sales sometimes prove difficult to apply to the commodity called "education." However, more and more institutions are finally increasing their administrative staffs and setting up their own fiscal books.

Until four years ago, the Tulane medical school deficit was included in the overall university deficit, said Mr. Gulchard. The medical school simply received an annual budget identifying the levels of expenditure but failing to detail any shortfall in income.

Finally in 1966, Mr. Gulchard moved from his former position in the business office of Tulane University to set up a separate accounting department for the medical center, including not only the medical school but also the School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine and other medical activities.

Inflation, increasing graduate enrollments, decreasing endowment earnings, and less-than-ideal business practices have all added to the fiscal instability of many medical schools.

Probably the most important single factor in the current money crunch, however, is the dependence of the schools on federal funds.

More than half of the \$1.1 billion expended by the medical schools in 1967-1968 were government funds, with one-third of the total provided under federal research and training grants.

Moreover, a large proportion of the available dollars were for "sponsored programs" in the form of contracts, restricted grants, or restricted gifts.

According to the AAMC, 58% of the total budgets of all the medical schools in 1967-1968 was derived from such sponsored support. The problem with funds for sponsored programs is that they must be used "according to terms and restrictions specified by the sponsors and agreed to by the school," said the association's report.

"In many schools the expenditures for sponsored programs comprise between 70% and 80% of total expenditures. This means that outside organizations are in a position to influence or dictate operating policies regarding the activities supported by these funds. . . . In those institutions in which sponsored program plays such a predominant role, unexpected changes in the policies of granting agencies for sponsored program funds have an unfavorable effect on total medical school operations and produce instability in faculty and institutional policies. Long-term planning becomes difficult when the sources of support are unpredictable."

Today, this inherent possibility that federal funds might be drastically reduced has come to pass. The war in Indochina, a decrease of congressional support for research, the burgeoning costs of Medicare and Medicaid, and the now forlorn hope by the administration for a balanced budget have sharply cut the funds available to the medical schools.

Speaking recently at the University of Illinois College of Medicine, Robert Q. Marston, M.D., director of the National Institutes of Health, estimated that the budget cuts have combined with inflation to produce a 25% reduction in biomedical research since the funding peak of 1966-1967.

This fall-off in research also dealt a severe blow to medical education because much of the financial spin-off from the research effort was used to support teaching.

NIH officials insist there have been few cases where money was willfully siphoned out of a research grant and slipped directly into medical education. "Indeed, the utilization of research funds for nonresearch purposes, despite much loose talk to the contrary, has in fact been controlled by rather rigid monitoring," said Dr. Marston. "Failure to show research productivity at the time of competing renewal applications has almost certainly jeopardized future support, despite pleas of salutary influences on teaching or service activities."

However, the faculties at many medical schools have grown or been strengthened because the institutions were able to offer the time and facilities to conduct research along with the possibility of collaboration with well-known investigators.

The schools, particularly the private institutions, were forced to develop their teaching capabilities through research simply because government funds were not available to support medical education directly, according to James A. Shannon, M.D., who was director of the NIH from 1955 to 1969, and is now affiliated with the Rockefeller University.

In a presentation at the University of Chicago Division of Biological Sciences and Pritzker School of Medicine, Dr. Shannon noted there has been strong opposition particularly from Congress, to direct federal involvement in higher education in general, and medical education in particular. Fund-

ing support for medical instruction itself was not possible until the passage of the Health Professions Education Assistance Act in 1963 and the Health Manpower Act of 1968.

From 1956 to 1966, the NIH budget and the research effort increased about 30% each year. These increases were accompanied, however, by "inadequate provision for the stabilization of the institutions which contained the research activities," said Dr. Shannon.

Money was available to build research laboratories, to buy research equipment, and to pay the salaries of the researchers themselves. Medical school faculty members and administrators responded by adopting what Robert J. Glaser, M.D., called the Willie Sutton Principle. Speaking at the 80th Annual Meeting of the AAMC last fall, the former dean of the Stanford University School of Medicine said that when Willie Sutton was asked why he always chose to rob banks, he answered, "That's where the money is!"

"Inevitably scientists responded to the availability of funds for work in certain fields by directing their efforts to those fields," said Dr. Glaser. Despite efforts to maintain a balance, the structure of many schools lost any semblance of symmetry. This asymmetry could have been kept in check had there been a reasonable amount of institutional funds concomitantly available to the dean for general support of this institution."

The practice of awarding most research and training grants to individual investigators has had a major influence on the salary structures at many medical schools. During the 1968-1969 school year, approximately one-fourth of the full-time faculty received 50% or more of their salaries from grants, and 3,466 of the nation's medical academicians were paid entirely out of research or training awards. In general, the AAMC report stated, "federal sources were paying about one-third of the total faculty salaries in medical schools."

At Tulane, the federal government provides roughly two-thirds of the annual \$12 million medical school budget, including some \$4 million in salaries. Since paying for the services of the faculty and the technical staff accounts for more than 85% of Tulane's expenditures, "inflation in salaries or cutbacks in support really hurt," said Dean Sparks.

Grant money that took care of faculty salaries has relieved the schools of the same salary burdens in the past, but it has also created other definite problems.

"It is no secret that some faculty members feel that their primary allegiance belongs to the granting agency that supports their work," said Dr. Glaser in his Cincinnati speech. "It is, I suppose, understandable that an individual whose activities are financed in large part from extra-university sources might question the rights of the dean or other university officers to inject themselves into the management of finances he has attracted. But in some schools, such faculty members constitute what may be described as independent enclaves, relating only in a superficial way to the parent enterprise."

Another problem has been persuading some researchers to leave the laboratory work for which they are being paid and conduct more class hours needed to meet the demands of increased enrollments.

And that is not the whole story. For now that the funding cuts have begun to strike deeply, medical school administrators find that many researchers have been faculty members long enough to have built up tenure. More and more institutions now find themselves saddled with increasing salary costs that they hardly anticipated.

"I am afraid that many young people are becoming more interested in security rather than research and teaching," said Paul C.

Beaver, Ph. D., chairman of the Department of Parasitology at Tulane School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine.

The sudden reduction in grants has generated widespread morale problems, especially among youthful scientists, he explained. "Many of them are disillusioned and have lost their spirit of aggressiveness. The insecurity has also made them doubt the significance of their own work, and this is bound to reflect in their teaching," said Dr. Beaver.

Few faculty vacancies at leading schools of medicine are being filled when they occur, "and the salary money saved is used to try to cover routine pay increases," said Dr. Anlyan. The overall effect of the reductions in federal funding amounts to a "gradual atrophy" in the nation's research effort, the physician said.

Although the NIH cuts in research grants took place across-the-board last year, their impact varied widely among the nation's medical schools according to the amount of research on each campus and even in each department.

A look at Tulane will serve to illustrate this:

George E. Burch, M.D., chairman of Tulane's Department of Medicine since 1947 and editor of the *American Heart Journal*, said his department had never become overly dependent on large federal training grants and that the teaching and research activities in medicine were not greatly affected.

The Department of Surgery, in contrast, has suffered heavily according to Theodore Drapanas, M.D., the department chairman. "More than \$250,000 in grants, including one cardiovascular training grant started 15 years ago will end on June 30," said Dr. Drapanas. A renal transplantation center sponsored by Tulane and funded by the NIH for six years has had its funds slashed. The work was salvaged only by assimilating the project on a much smaller scale in Charity Hospital's dialysis program.

The department now has 26 full-time faculty members augmented by part-time instructors who donate their time. "We lost two faculty members in just the last year, and these additional vacancies will also remain unfilled," said Dr. Drapanas.

Both Dr. Burch and Dr. Drapanas agree that the reductions in federal funds will harm the development of faculty members for the future. "By cutting off funds, the government is cutting out the teachers needed to produce more physicians," said Dr. Burch. "I'm afraid that we've already lost a generation of young, future faculty members as well as losing many good people from the current faculty to private practice," said Dr. Drapanas. "They can always go out and triple their income when they leave."

"Contrary to what you may have heard recently, there has been no decision to abandon the training grant business," NIH's Dr. Marston recently told the faculty at the University of Illinois College of Medicine.

"For the last five years, serious questions have been raised that more people would be trained than could be supported by the money available for research," he said. The years 1969 and 1970 saw an \$18 million drop in funding for research fellowships and training grants, but Dr. Marston thinks that the NIH will be able to hold that line in the 1971 budget. Although NIH grants would remain level, cuts might appear in the National Science Foundation training program, he said.

When asked where he would look for funds if he were once more the dean of the University of Mississippi Medical School, Dr. Marston said he would turn to patient care because of the large amounts of money available. "The schools that can solve the current problems in this area will probably be in the best financial shape," he said.

Tulane has already chosen a version of this approach to help solve some of the school's

financial problems, according to John J. Walsh, M.D., vice-president for health affairs at Tulane University, and director of the university's medical center.

"The third largest source of support for medical education financially in this country today, is the clinical income of the medical faculty," Dr. Walsh told Medical News. On a national basis, the money earned by the clinical faculty amounts to slightly more than 20% of the earnings of all medical schools, he explained. At the present time, only about 10% of Tulane's income is derived from this source, with most of the money coming from Medicare and Medicaid services provided at Charity Hospital, the school's major teaching hospital.

Most of the 259 full-time faculty members are employed as "geographic full-time faculty," said Dr. Walsh. Under this type of an arrangement, the academicians are allowed up to 15% of their time for private practice and they keep all the money earned this way.

Over the next five years, however, the faculty will convert to a different structure known as "strict full-time." Under the new setup, all the income earned by the faculty will go into departmental accounts. The money left after generous salaries will be used to support the school.

Two smaller departments—psychiatry and neurology—and the section of urology, have already converted to the new arrangement. They involve 38 physicians in all. "Our entire faculty is committed to becoming 'strict full-time' by 1975," said Dr. Walsh.

This new approach involves a certain number of problems. New beds must be found, facilities built, and reimbursement agreements have to be worked out with third-party payers. The school's plans have to be explained to practitioners in the community to avoid competition for patients, and the medical school must learn how to walk the fine line between too much practice and too much teaching, added Dr. Walsh. "Our eventual goal is to have our services break even after paying the salaries to the faculty members."

This approach has been tried successfully by other schools and seems to be a growing trend around the country. Some medical schools have operated clinics for paying patients for many years.

Some of the other financial solutions being tried by other medical schools are not available to Tulane. Direct subsidies from state governments, for instance, have helped some private medical schools to stay solvent. However, neither the current political climate nor the tax revenue situation in Louisiana seem to favor a similar solution for Tulane.

In Wisconsin, the Marquette School of Medicine skillfully engineered a separation from its Jesuit parent school. Having resolved the church-state issue, Marquette successfully appealed to the state legislature for funds and last October received a \$3.2 million grant which will keep its doors open for two years.

The Wisconsin supreme court which ruled that a state legislature could provide funds to a private school had plenty of precedents, said the AMA's Dr. Nicholson.

As former dean of the University of Miami School of Medicine, Dr. Nicholson knows about state subsidies. Miami (a private school) has received a subsidy since 1952. The subsidy provides the school each year with about \$4,500 for every Florida student enrolled.

Three of the seven medical schools in Pennsylvania are also considered to be "state-operated," said Dr. Nicholson. Although none of the institutions is owned by the state, the government pays the deficit incurred by medical schools at Temple University, the University of Pittsburgh, and the Pennsylvania State University at Hershey.

The other four medical schools are considered "state-aided" and receive a state sub-

sity based on a sliding scale tied to the number of students enrolled. Similar subsidies on a per-student basis have been passed in North Carolina, Ohio, and New York.

"Partial state subsidization of private medical schools is a wise and growing trend," said Dr. Nicholson. "By supporting these institutions the citizens of the states not only help provide a place for their children to study medicine, but also make their communities more attractive to physicians who are looking for the best care available for his patients."

"Pennsylvania is particularly forward-looking by providing money for every student enrolled regardless of his State of residence. Most of the other legislatures have limited aid to students from the home state."

State aid is not without certain pitfalls. Its extent can be unpredictable, due to demands on public funds for transportation, housing renewal, hunger, crime prevention, and other social problems.

Moreover, student unrest has generated pressures for greater accountability to state legislators.

"The penetration of state government into the universities is an important new facet," said Herbert E. Carter, Ph. D., vice-chancellor for academic affairs for the University of Illinois. "The state government and bureau of the budget have increased their control over funds that were previously much more flexible," Dr. Carter told MEDICAL NEWS. "At the same time that federal support is declining, the states are applying pressure to increase teaching loads and to divert funds to areas with social relevance."

Curriculum changes have also been proposed as a means of relieving the financial problems of the medical schools. Although most suggestions deal with speeding up or modifying the undergraduate medical years, a few would reduce the intern and resident load.

Some authorities would have the young MDs train with experienced physicians in a preceptorship status rather than being trained on various services. Tulane's faculty claim they are pleased with several fourth-year medical students who are performing as "junior interns" in an experimental elective program.

In the past, private foundations have sometimes provided at least temporary help for a medical school's financial problems. However, several changes have taken place in recent years to make these givers more uncertain sources.

The tax reform bill has spurred some foundations to distribute funds faster in order to comply with the law. However, the incomes of other groups are now taxed more heavily and as a result their donations have dropped.

The foundations have also developed new and different interests over the years, particularly in the area of social and racial problems, according to Alan Pifer, president of the Carnegie Corporation. Mr. Pifer told a recent symposium audience that the Carnegie Corporation maintains an interest in the plight of the medical schools. However, he indicated that the competition for the foundation's funds had increased dramatically with the fall-off in government support. "There is little hope that the foundations can pick up the slack," he said.

Finding someone to pick up the slack has become a more and more desperate matter for many medical school deans, especially as pressures increase for greater community involvement and the production of more MDs. "A lot of people would be happy to shift from research to the delivery of health care and education of students," said Tulane medical school's Dean Sparks "if someone would give us the wherewithal to make the shift."

LACK OF FIRM DATA ABOUT NEW NIH BUDGET COMPLICATES PLANNING

There is not much in the 1971 fiscal year budget to gladden the heart of a dean.

Although next year's NIH request to Congress exceeds the 1970 budget by more than \$93 million, little of the money will be directly available to help the schools out of their financial quagmires.

In the research area, for instance, NIH's regular grant program was increased by 3% in accordance with the administration's desire to "reverse the downward trend in the support of research and maintain the program level—that is, current dollars plus inflation—at a constant level, even during these times of difficult constraints."

The biggest increases in the research area arise among the collaborative research and development programs. Forty million additional dollars will be spent next year to investigate the possible viral etiology of cancer, arteriosclerosis, family planning, maternal and child health, and dental caries.

However, only half of the research contracts have ended up in academic laboratories in the past. The rest of the funds have gone to private research institutions, industrial firms, or various non-profit research organizations.

Even if a contract went to someone in his medical school, the dean would probably derive little more than the researcher's presence and possibly a few hours of teaching time.

One reduction in the research portion of NIH's budget will put additional pressure on school administrators. General Research Support Grants, one of the few research awards given on an institutional basis, are being cut by 20%.

Deans have wide latitude on how they can spend these monies in supporting research. Some administrators were able to stabilize their faculties by using the funds for salaries. Other schools channeled the funds into machine shops or central laboratories needed to support their research effort. The only limitation is that the money cannot be used for new buildings or renovation.

"When I was a dean, these funds were manna from heaven," Roger O. Egeberg, M.D., said in an interview. The assistant secretary for health and scientific affairs in Health, Education and Welfare explained to Medical News that the \$10 million reduction in General Research Support Grants had been used to balance some of the other increases.

Just about the only other places where an administrator can hope to find some general support funds lie within the funding categories established by the Health Professions Education Assistance Act in 1963 (Public Law 89-290) and the Health Manpower Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-490).

Under these provisions, the dean can apply for three types of grants:

- Construction Grants;
- Institutional or Formula Grants; and
- Special Projects Grants.

A dean can use construction grant money to build new teaching facilities or renovate old classrooms. He can even include some research and administrative spaces as long as teaching remains the main purpose of the building. The 1971 fiscal year construction grant requests for NIH amount to \$126 million, about the same as in 1970.

Institutional grants, sometimes called formula grants or basic improvement grants, have been slashed by \$2.4 million. These funds are distributed to all accredited medical schools and other health training institutions according to a formula based on the number of students enrolled.

These funds are prized. Just about the only restrictions on how they may be spent involve building or research support. The \$250,000 to \$270,000 received annually at

Tulane, for example, has been used primarily for faculty salaries.

Two years ago, Tulane also won a \$1,500,000 Special Project Grant (otherwise known as a Special Improvement Grant). Funds in this program are granted to selected schools for specific projects, rather than going to all training institutions. At Tulane, the \$300,000 annual installment has been used to add faculty members in the basic sciences and to attract new department chairmen.

An increase of more than \$14 million has been requested for next year's NIH budget, raising the funds available for special project grants to \$69.5 million. Part of the increase came from the cut in institutional grants, Dr. Egeberg said. In this way, the planners hope to help specific schools faster.

Included in the special project grant area is a new, highly visible program that will take effect in the fall. The Physicians Augmentation Program had an original goal of increasing the size of the 1970-1971 freshman class in medical schools by 1,000 students. But the \$10 million set aside for the program sufficed to create only 443 new first-year slots in 29 schools of medicine and osteopathy. (JAMA Medical News 212:1291 [May 25] 1970.)

The institutions competed for the funds on the basis of need as well as the capability to expand their enrollments. Plans for money from the Physician's Augmentation Program span the spectrum from construction to salaries.

All these programs don't add up to many sources of general support for the medical school dean, however. And there is still some doubt as to how much money will ultimately be available. Dr. Egeberg told MEDICAL NEWS that he is waiting to see what Congress does about the NIH budget—and when. The former dean of the University of Southern California Medical School remains also hopeful that he will be able to secure some sort of supplemental funds to support the medical education effort.

"One of the reasons the schools are having such problems is that they haven't heard any clear signals from Washington," said Dr. Egeberg.

"Personally, if I were a dean again, I would be waiting to see what kinds of new directions are forthcoming from government before pushing ahead too far with some of my programs."

However, it seems that the prerequisite for large-scale government aid to medical education would be a major change in public philosophy.

Congress, state legislatures, and the taxpayers all will need to be convinced that the teaching side of medical education deserves no less support than research. This support could be accomplished by modifying—or totally changing—the existing machinery for supporting research, but such changes can come about only after the change in philosophy.

The impetus for such a change may come from the medical profession. A joint AMA-AAMC statement two years ago called for a national policy which would assure a place in medical school for "every young person interested in and qualified for entry to the study of medicine."

During his tenure as the elected leader of the AAMC, Dr. Anlyan hopes to persuade his constituency to develop a health strategy program for 1985 by "working the domino-theory backwards."

"We should try to decide which highly visible health goals the nation would like to have by that time; goals such as the lowest infant mortality rate. Then we can show what medical resources will be needed in 1980, 1975, and backward to tomorrow," Dr. Anlyan said in an interview. "Academia and all the practicing health professionals should

develop the blueprint and let the government react to it rather than vice versa."

An opportunity for a national examination of medical school support may be at hand. In a speech last fall to a group of physicians, NIH's Dr. Marston noted that the Health Manpower Act of 1968 provided for only three years' support and comes up for congressional renewal early in 1971.

"Hopefully, consolidation of this legislation will stimulate appropriate debate on how best to arrange for this aspect of NIH and the academic life," Dr. Marston told the physicians. "You have an opportunity as individuals and as an organization to contribute to the discussions."

LEGAL PROFITS AND ILLEGAL DRUGS

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, this body's Select Committee on Crime, which I have the honor of serving as chairman, recently completed 5 days on hearings in New York City on the heroin traffic. We heard testimony that traced the flow of this deadly drug from the poppy fields of Turkey to the clandestine laboratories of France to the shores of this country.

As the result of an investigation by committee staff members, we also brought before the committee several drugstore owners and other merchants who, it appears, sold large quantities of drugstore owners and other merchants the paraphernalia used to dilute and package heroin. We were shocked at the huge potential for profit for those who engage in selling what are, at face, perfectly legal items that end up in the illicit drug traffic. The editors of Time magazine shared our concern about these merchants on the periphery of the heroin traffic and wrote an excellent article on the problem, which appears in the July 20 issue. I would like to include that article in the RECORD at this point:

DRUGS, PARAPHERNALIA, INC.

In the argot of the drug world, it is "paraphernalia": the necessary accouterments to merchandising heroin. The small glassine envelopes, or "bags," used to package heroin are paraphernalia. So, too, are the legal, harmless powders used to dilute the drug, usually quinine, dextrose, lactose or mannite. According to a House Select Committee on Crime investigation in New York City, peddling paraphernalia has grown into a \$5,000,000-a-year business.

One outlet, the Harlem Stationery Co., sold 52,000,000 glassine bags in 1969 alone, accounting for nearly 20% of the store's \$500,000 sales. A Harlem drugstore, the Co-Op Pharmacy, peddled 47 million bags over a two-year period for an estimated \$100,000 profit. There are, of course, other users of the envelopes, such as watch repairmen and stamp collectors, but the committee concluded that most bags sold in Harlem were used to package heroin.

The Co-Op Pharmacy also sold 40,000 ounces of quinine, worth \$60,000, in the same two-year period. Estimated revenues from the sales were between \$1,000,000 and \$1,400,000. The committee was told that regular sales of quinine and the other heroin additives would only total a few hundred thousand dollars a year for all of New York City.

Last week a 14-year-old Harlem youth died from an overdose of heroin. He was the 102nd teen-ager to die from drug-related causes so far this year in New York City; 322 adults have also been killed by drugs in the same period. To slow one aspect of this lethal trade the committee members are studying the possibility of new legislation to control the sale of paraphernalia, including quota systems for the sale of heroin additives. In an attempt to help, the United States Envelope Co. of Springfield, Mass., which manufactures glassine envelopes, last week announced that it will sharply limit production and distribution of its bag-sized envelopes.

THE PERIL OF IGNORANCE

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to insert at this time the revised and expanded version of a speech I made in Indianapolis in May 1970:

THE PERIL OF IGNORANCE

(By WILLIAM G. BRAY)

(Prepared for delivery for Armed Forces Day at Stouffer's Inn, Indianapolis, Indiana, May, 1970—Later revised and extended.)

Know the enemy and know yourself; in a hundred battles you will never be in peril. . . . When you are ignorant of the enemy but know yourself, your chances of winning or losing are equal. If ignorant both of your enemy and of yourself, you are certain in every battle to be in peril.

Those ageless words spoken 25 centuries ago are a clear warning to us today. The bleaching bones of a hundred countries that either failed to heed them or failed then to act in their national interest and safety, stand as silent reminders of the truth Plato grimly wrote 300 years before Christ: "Only the dead have seen the end of war."

A glance at history's chronicles will show very, very few periods in the span of written human history where there was not in some patch of the sky above the globe that "harry of midnight cavalry, riding the wind."

So, like it or not, any country that hopes to remain externally secure in a world in which the unprincipled and aggressive will prey upon the weak must keep itself spiritually, economically and militarily strong.

Just over a year ago I visited Tunis and spent a day searching for the ancient battlefield of Zama where in 200 BC the Roman forces under Scipio Africanus eliminated Carthage from the world. Carthage was so interested in her wealth, had become so greedy, so selfish that she forgot that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance. The Cathaginian became so intent upon the clicking of gold pouring into his tills, so enchanted with the roar of the growing commerce, so careless of his personal responsibility to serve his country that he could not hear Cato daily shouting in the Roman Senate: "Delenda est Carthago" (Carthage must be destroyed).

We do not need to go back 20 centuries to realize the danger and evil that can result from allowing blind trust, stupidity, and selfishness to wreck a civilization. It was less than 40 years ago that Chamberlain tucked his umbrella under his arm and went to Munich to appease Hitler and give him what Chamberlain did not have to give: the freedom of Czechoslovakia. Many of us still remember the wild cheering that followed Chamberlain's proud announcement: "We have attained peace in our time."

The sacrifice was so unnecessary. Hitler did

not have the strength at that time to overrun Europe. All he needed was Chamberlain's surrender and this he received.

Now as then we have the "doom-shouters" who at the top of their lungs scream that we are drifting into a militaristic society and shriek incessantly of what this is doing to us as individuals and to use as a nation. During these last few weeks we have heard their hysterical shrieks of outrage that our President took the measures he had to take to protect our soldiers from an enemy who had taken sanctuary in a country that is trying to be neutral. These shouters, like Chamberlain, seem to have forgotten that freedom and liberty are expensive luxuries, but their alternative—slavery, can be even more expensive.

I recently read a book most complimentary to the great productive "know-how" of America. This book, the American Challenge, was written by J. J. Servan-Schreiber, a Frenchman. It clearly recognizes that the American inventiveness, engineering and productive capacity exceeds the wildest dreams of man. However, this story of our country's industrial, economic and financial strength also brought to me an awesome fear for the future of our civilization if we ever allow America and Americans to deteriorate physically, mentally and spiritually to the point where we can no longer capably control and utilize the tremendous material strength which we are able to produce.

HATRED, THE ORDER OF THE DAY

While reading this tribute to America's greatness, I was also reading in every paper of the violence of American youth. Not violence by the poor, the underprivileged, the working youth, but by our college youth who are the beneficiaries of the greatest freedom, the greatest opportunity, the highest degree of living and luxury ever enjoyed by any youth in history. The overwhelming majority of American youth today are fine, dedicated young people; but many of them do not realize the growing problem posed by the small but violent group of activists. Many tolerantly view these activists as just another group "doing their thing." In every paper in America we read of a segment of these youth spewing hatred on America and all that America stands for. At the same time they revel in praise of America's enemies. These youths are joined and defended, and in many instances directed, by leftist professors who are being paid their salaries by American taxpayers.

We need to be informed as to the cause and purpose of these anti-American acts. In the words of Sun Tzu, let's dispel our "ignorance of the enemy." Only the naive doubt that much of the impetus and planning for the "hate America" campaign comes from our enemies abroad, but the real danger is from the enemy within our country.

There is a vast difference between dissent, which is the very essence of a democracy, and attempts to destroy our country by violence. To those violent ones, America is always wrong, our enemy is always right; peace is the surrender of the United States; and disarmament means disarmament by the United States. Let us face the issue squarely: the only act that our country could perform today that would bring this small but vicious and violent band of anti-American leftists back into the national structure would be the act of total surrender to Hanoi. And yet even this yielding would bring only a temporary calm while another anti-American "cause" was being established.

By the philosophy of the violent activist throwing a rock or a golf ball spiked with nails calculated to blind or maim a policeman is "legal dissent," but reaction by the police or other law enforcement officials to protect themselves or other innocent victims is "repression" by "Fascist pigs."

One of the goals of this violence is to destroy the ROTC (Reserve Officers Training

Corps). Scores of ROTC buildings on college campuses have been bombed or burned. The ROTC is not a part of so-called "militarism." No students are required to be members of ROTC. The ROTC is an adjunct of the concept of the citizen soldier (a soldier in war and a citizen in peace) which has enabled the United States to remain strong and yet unimpaired through its 194 years of existence. Why should these youthful, activists attempt to destroy the ROTC, which they in no way are forced to join or work with?

Back of all this violence is the goal of destruction of this country, for to maintain an adequate armed force to protect America, the ROTC is necessary. Violent students never protest the enormous armed forces of Russia and Red China or any other enemy of the United States. No acts of aggression by Russia, Mao's China, North Vietnam or North Korea can rate a word of criticism in the "hate-America" campaign.

Another target of this destruction has been the CIA (Central Intelligence Agency), the foreign intelligence arm of the United States. Why is New Left violence directed against the CIA? Without knowledge of enemy activities America would be helpless to defend herself against foreign aggression. Without knowledge of the enemy, our country would be in the position of the magnificent Samson, about whom the blind English genius, John Milton, wrote so feelingly and agonizingly:

*Eyeless in Gaza, at the mill with slaves,
O loss of light, of thee I most complain!
What boots it at one gate to make defense,
And another to let in the foe? . . .*

What, then, is the principal goal of the New Left? The goal is clear: The only end that they will accept is the defeat of this country by Hanoi.

HATRED OF THEIR COUNTRY—PRAISE OF ITS ENEMIES

Student rioters do not express a word of criticism of the vicious Secret Police of the Soviet Union, the KGB, but they express nothing but hate and vituperation for the CIA. The murder of millions and the indescribable brutality of the Soviet Secret Police, the Cheka of Lenin, the NKVD of Stalin that directed the purges of the 1930's and the Katyn Forest Massacre, and the KGB of today are ignored.

There is no criticism of murder and starvation by the Soviets, or of the denial of freedom to millions in Russia and her satellite countries. The brutal enslavement of Hungary and Czechoslovakia do not rate a word of rebuke.

These proponents of violence among our youth are dedicated to hatred—hatred of fathers, schools, fellowmen and their country. The flags they carry are the red flag of Communism, the black flag of anarchy and the Viet Cong flag. The flag they defile is the Stars and Stripes, the flag of their own country.

Violent students do not raise a word of protest against Viet Cong invasion of neutral Cambodia to use as a sanctuary to launch attacks against South Vietnamese and Americans. Yet these same activists scream against the "establishment" when American troops, at the request of the Cambodian government, entered that country to drive out the Viet Cong invaders and save the lives of their fellow Americans. The New Left is not only bitterly opposed to the United States assisting the South Vietnamese in maintaining their freedom; they oppose with equal hate any plan whereby the local South Vietnamese can retain this freedom by their own effort. Difficult though it is to understand, the goal of this violence, not realized, however by many of those participating, is a Communist takeover and victory.

These youths who plan to destroy the "establishment" feign friendship with Black

youths. In actual fact, they have proved by word and deed that they have only contempt for the Blacks and desire from them only their assistance against the "establishment."

In 1968 violent student riots brought Columbia University, which had formerly been one of our great universities, to her knees, all in the alleged interest of civil rights. The excuse used was that the Morningside Gym was being constructed at a location that should be used for the Blacks of Harlem. In a speech later before the Harvard Chapter of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), Mark Rudd, President of SDS and now a fugitive from justice, said that he "didn't even know where the Morningside Gym was" yet he led that riot. Later in the same speech Rudd said that there was only one issue in the confrontation: "whether or not American universities should be destroyed." In the May 19, 1968, issue of the New York Times, Rudd admitted:

"I was never really attached to civil rights. There was too much idealization of Negroes. I have always felt a tremendous barrier between me and Blacks."

Mike Klonsky, secretary of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), has stated:

"The civil rights movement was finally buried with Martin Luther King's assassination."

Although the Blacks, individually and through organizations such as the Black Panthers, have at times worked with the New Left in acts of violence, they have a different motivation: while the violent white students would destroy the government and society, the Blacks want a greater share in that government and society. Violent methods which they pursue are wrong and self-defeating, but their goals are at least more understandable.

The New Left in the United States and the New Left of every other free country attack embassies and desecrate flags of all countries that are free. What do these violent youth want? It is not a democracy. The "gods" they worship—Che Guevara, Mao Tse-tung, Fidel Castro—all dedicated their lives to destruction of democracy.

The "free speech movement" (1964-1965) was launched at the University of California at Berkeley, the university at that time with perhaps the highest degree of freedom of speech and action of any university in any country in the world. The real purpose was to wreck the school and to deny freedom of speech to all who disagreed with the organizers of the "movement."

Violent students would change that great declaration of Voltaire to Helvetius:

"I disapprove of what you say, but will defend to the death your right to say it."

"I disapprove of what you say and I will fight to your death to destroy your right to say it."

The New Left has nothing but contempt for labor and the betterment of labor conditions. This summer the youthful activists are renewing their efforts to take over organized labor, as they temporarily cease their campus violence during vacation and join summer labor forces while the schools are closed.

Another of the "gods" of the New Left is Professor Herbert Marcuse, who has only hostility for organized labor. As Professor Marcuse states it, American labor has provided our economy with the products needed and desired to such a degree that it dulls the "lust for revolution." The New Left is dedicated to the destruction of free labor in America and is proceeding toward that goal. To realize his goals, Professor Marcuse would restrict free assembly and free speech to those who espouse causes which he determines to be right.

Those who would destroy America are few in number, but it should be remembered that Mark Rudd stated initially he had fewer than 150 followers when he wrecked Columbia University in 1968; Lenin had fewer than 14,

000 followers, when he took over Russia, and a relative handful goose-stepped Hitler into power.

ORGANIZED HATRED

Where and when was this hatred of school, society and government spawned? It is always present in some segments of society, including youth. In years past this feeling has been referred to as the "sons who hate their fathers." However, the current hate campaign received a great and organized boost in the violence planned and engendered by the misnamed "freedom of speech movement" at Berkeley in 1964 and 1965. This violence was organized and directed by various leftist groups, including Communists, leftist faculty members and non-students.

This philosophy, however, received its greatest single impetus at the Labor Day weekend convention of the National Conference for New Politics held at the Palmer House in Chicago in 1967.

Present at this meeting were representatives of approximately 300 leftist organizations: Communists of many breeds—Marxists, Soviet and Chinese. There were Trotskyites and Castro and Che Guevara Communists. Also present were anarchists, sexual perverts, arsonists, thieves, hippies and drug addicts. The meeting was one of disorder, hatred and violence. The theme was hatred—hatred of America, hatred of America's heritage, hatred of fathers, hatred of schools, hatred of everything for which America stands.

Columnist Victor Riesel described the meeting:

"It was like entering the Gates of Hell and finally coming out on the other side."

Baltimore Sun columnist Gerald Griffin said:

"This political mess attempted at Chicago is as ugly as it is poisonous."

There was no united organization formed at the Palmer House meeting, but out of this inferno did emerge a clear understanding of what these people are against: they are against America and want destruction of her institutions, especially her educational system. Their ruling passion is "hate America."

From this meeting the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) emerged as the leading organization for the hate America conclave. At a later convention the SDS was split by a disagreement and the ultra-violent Weatherman branch of the SDS came into being. The Weatherman branch, in meetings in Cuba and later in Flint, Michigan, concentrated on plans for launching increased violence—plans which have since been carried out. A variety of mobilization committees have added their part to the "hate America" theme.

What part is Russia, Red China, Cuba, North Vietnam, North Korea, and other Communist countries, as well as the Communist Party in the United States, playing in this planned hatred of America in the directing of the organized violence on the campus and in the streets of America? Activists of the anti-American New Left do make visits to these Communist countries where they receive encouragement and issue statements through the news media—statements filled with hatred for America and preaching its overthrow and destruction. Both these visiting anti-Americans and the Communist leaders desire the overthrow of America. However, these anti-American activists envision a type of government far different from that which presently exists in Communist countries.

The violent student is against all government and law and controls or direction—the Communist type of government is exactly the opposite. Not only is the individual regimented as to government, but to his economics, political and personal life. These Communist countries and the Communist Party in America do make use of the New Left to

destroy our democracy, so that in the ensuing chaos and anarchy they will be able to seize control and establish Communist control.

After Lenin and Trotsky seized control in Russia in December 1917, Trotsky turned his artillery on the anarchist headquarters in Moscow and quickly destroyed not only the anarchists but all Russians who demanded the freedom they had been promised by the Communists before they seized control.

The strongest and most bitter criticism expressed against the Communists, destroying the freedom and liberty that they espoused before seizing control, have been written by ex-Communists themselves, such as: Emma Goldman, 1869-1940; Alexander Berkman, 1870-1936; Peter Kropotkin 1842-1921.

It is interesting that Lenin before gaining control in Russia, used the college youth to promote anarchy and destroy government in Russia similar to the same actions being taken by the leaders of the New Left in the United States today. A letter written by Lenin from Paris on October 16, 1905 (this was twelve years before he finally seized control) instructed:

"... Go to the youth, gentlemen! That is the only remedy! ... Go to the youth. Form fighting squads at once everywhere, among the students and especially among the workers. Let groups be at once organized of three, ten, thirty persons. Let them arm themselves at once as best they can, be it with a revolver, a knife, a rag soaked in kerosene for starting fires ... Do not make membership in the party an absolute condition—that would be an absurd demand for an armed uprising.

"The propagandists must supply each group with brief and simple recipes for making bombs ... some may at once undertake to kill a spy or blow up a police station, others to raid a bank ... Let every group learn, if it be only by beating up policemen ..."

Why should the enemies of America at home and abroad wish to destroy this country, its heritage and all its potential? Is it that America is in error in building freedom and dignity, or is it that these enemies would destroy our country because of America's success and greatness? To obtain a true answer to these questions is most important to America and Americans in the coming battle. As in the ageless words of Sun Tzu:

"Know the enemy and know yourself."

A CHALLENGE TO AMERICA

It sickens the patriotic American to see our country blasphemed by every filthy beatnik, by the "hate America conclave," and by every country in the world that would destroy freedom. The great majority of people in every country and race want what we have in America, but there is a grave danger, however, that constant accusations and bitter tirades against our country may so erode our will, our confidence and faith in our heritage and greatness, that we may lose confidence in the freedom and dignity of man.

Our country in its infancy suffered problems similar to those we have on the home front today. Just as at Valley Forge the battle is for the minds of men, rather than in a glamorous battlefield where all can be risked in one dramatic act.

Washington at Valley Forge was faced on all sides with those who would surrender their freedom and dignity because they felt it was not worth the battle. He was continually attacked by the press and dissident elements. Even his chaplain, his pastor, turned on freedom and preached surrender. Many turned their backs on freedom and deserted to the comforts of Philadelphia.

In spite of these people, who would desert freedom and all other reverses, Washington and that small but brave and loyal band of patriots finally won the battle for the minds

of man and went on to build the finest nation that has ever existed.

Today, those of the violent left on the campuses and in the streets, like their counterparts at Valley Forge, have turned their backs on freedom and the dignity of man—if they ever believed in this freedom and dignity at all.

No country that ever existed has given its citizens such freedom and opportunity, such a high standard of living as has the United States. No country has so unselfishly assisted other countries and peoples.

Four times in this century American youth have gone abroad to fight for the freedom of other peoples. Each time our goal was altruistic: we assisted friends and enemies alike and we have never asked for or accepted anything in return. We may have been in error at times in helping others so freely, we may have trusted those who were untrustworthy, but our errors have been on the part of trust, love and altruism instead of hate and selfishness.

Why should the New Left attack America? The answer is simple. The United States is the last great and powerful bastion of freedom capable of stopping an aggressor from riding over the world.

THE GENERATION GAP AND YOUTHFUL VIOLENCE

The number of American youth who are dedicated to violence, who wreck their schools and country is very small, but we must not ignore the potential seriousness of the growing threat of violence today. When the psychology of the mob takes over, and that is what is happening in many localities today, it is impossible to determine the extent to which other people, especially the young will be swept into mob action. Their lack of experience, coupled with youthful emotion and enthusiasm makes them more prone to be followers of the mob.

Youthful movements are never moderate. Young people are more volatile than their elders and more prone to radical actions, one way or the other. Youth through the ages have never trusted their elders. In all movements of youthful violence we hear the refrain, "One must never trust anyone over 30," Peter N. Tkachev (1844-1885), a youthful Russian revolutionary in the last century, even proposed killing everyone over 30.

In order to better understand the thinking of youth, various business and professional groups have requested leaders who have been active in youth violence to address them. They have been astonished to hear these leaders, clearly and lucidly, in effect, state:

"We have education and knowledge, and we are not encumbered by experience; so we are better able to run the country and your business than you."

They proudly state their minds are not confused—polluted, they call it—by experience as are the leaders of our business, political, economic, and industrial world—and, therefore, they must run it. In recent visits college youth have also astonished Members of Congress by expressing this same philosophy: that experience must be disregarded and youth must lead because their knowledge is far more important than the experience gained in later life.

The adult world should not be shocked at these expressions as it has been inherently the thinking of youth through the ages. They resent the importance attached to experience. This resentment of the knowledge gained by experience is one of the reasons that today's violent youth are often followers of the philosophy of Mao Tse-tung, who has expressed the most bitter denunciation of experience gained from the past. Communist papers of Red China, following Mao's philosophy, have called Western scientific and book knowledge "a pot of garbage" and have stated that, because of the teachings of Mao, "the technical practices applied all over the world have become obsolete."

The violent youth of today, however, apparently cannot see the chaos into which Mao's philosophy of ignoring the knowledge and experience of the past has dumped China's industry, government and economy.

History has recorded many instances of the university youth of a country taking a violent stand against and to the detriment of their country in favor of a foreign enemy. Quoting Winston Churchill:

"The students of the Oxford Union, under the inspiration of a Mr. Joad, passed their ever-shameful resolution, 'That this House refuses to fight for King and country.' It was easy to laugh off such an episode in England, but in Germany, in Russia, in Italy, in Japan, the idea of a decadent, degenerate Britain took deep root and swayed many calculations. Little did the foolish boys who passed the resolution dream that they were destined quite soon to conquer or fall gloriously in the ensuing war, and prove themselves the finest generation ever bred in Britain. Less excuse can be found for their elders, who had no chance of self-repudiation in action."

Among many similar actions by students was the vote by students at Princeton in 1940, acclaiming Adolph Hitler the "Man of the Year" because he got things done!

A humorous and often-told story expresses youth questioning the knowledge and experience of their fathers: A son twenty years his father's junior, remarked when his father reached sixty:

"Dad, when you were forty and I was twenty, you were ignorant. It's remarkable how much you have learned in the last twenty years."

The public has been generally confused as to what the young really want and baffled by the recurring chorus: "You are not listening to the youth." This is certainly erroneous. Perhaps there has never been a time in history when parents, faculty and public officials have listened to youth as they do today. What the radical youth means is: "You are not doing what we tell you to do."

The normal resentment of youth against the importance their elders attach to experience, which is what we really mean by the "generation gap," does not often manifest itself with violence when there are close family ties or when the youth has the responsibility to assist his family or others. The resentment of the normal young person in a normal setting usually works itself off as a part of growing up. Neither does "generation gap" result in contempt and violence when the youth has some definite objective in life or an objective in his school work. It seldom produces violence among those who are working either to support a family or to obtain money with which to gain an education.

We need to examine this problem carefully to try to find where we, the older generation, have permitted a "generation gap" to grow to such proportions that senseless violence has resulted.

One factor that has encouraged violence today is that too many view all youthful movements as something fine and wholesome. The rosy-hued glasses through which many are inclined to view youth tend to make us forget the truism that all movements of violence, whether motivated by good or evil, are sparked by youth. Youthful enthusiasm has, by violence, backed movements of love and hate, of war and peace, of building and destroying, of brilliance and stupidity.

The Children's Crusade of 1212 was one of the most useless, futile, and stupid events of history. The youth of that age were enthused, goaded, and directed into this tragic venture by their elders. When this Children's Crusade met its tragic end, those elder activists and leaders were not present. This is analogous to the conditions today where those who inspire and direct violence and mob action, whether among the youth on

the campus and streets, or the lynch mob, are in places of safety when violence repels the mob.

Lewis S. Feuer, in his monumental and well-documented work, *The Conflict of Generations*, states:

"With a few changes, the characters of the Parisian student movement of the 1830's are identical with those of the Russian movement of the 1890's, the Chinese movement of 1917, the Berkeley movement of 1964. The psychological types in history are universal; in diverse eras the same cast of characters acts out eternal human drives."

Feuer, in discussing the student activists in the literature of yesterday, points out:

"There was the everlasting student non-student, prolonging his adolescence and reenacting each semester his revolt against his elders, Balorel, a student of law, 'a student in his eleventh year,' who 'liked nothing as much as a quarrel unless it was a riot, and nothing so much as a riot except a revolution.' He was ever ready to break a pane of glass, tear up the paving stones, and demolish a government, in order to see the effect . . . There was the believer in the rule of the intellectual elite."

He later stated:

"The student movement is almost like a secret society of sons and daughters banded against the father."

Apparently the generation gap existed quite early in history. One of the earliest works on "right conduct" was *The Maxims of Ptahhotep*, written in the twenty-seventh century B.C. In his admonitions to youth (probably the king's son), the aged vizier wrote:

"Be not proud because of their learning. Take counsel with the unlearned as with the learned, for the limit of a craft is not fixed and there is no craftsman whose worth is perfect . . . How worthy it is when a son hearkens to his father . . . How many misdeeds befell him who hearkened not! . . . As for the fool who hearkens not there is none who has done anything for him. He regards wisdom as ignorance, and what is profitable as useless."

Twenty-four centuries later this generation gap, apparently, still existed. Aristotle, the great philosopher and teacher, (Alexander the Great was one of his pupils) wrote at some length and in detail on youth.

"Youth does not especially love money, not having yet learnt what it means to be without it . . . They trust others readily, because they have not yet often been cheated. They are sanguine . . . and besides that, they have met as yet with few disappointments."

They think of themselves, he declared, as an elite which can accomplish what others have not and continued:

"They have exalted notions, because they have not yet been humbled by life or learnt its necessary limitations; moreover, their hopeful disposition makes them think themselves equal to great things—and that means having exalted notions . . . their lives are regulated more by moral feeling than by reasoning . . . They think they know everything, and are always quite sure about it; this, in fact, is why they overdo everything."

Approximately twenty-three centuries later, Walter Laqueur in a comprehensive study entitled *Reflections of Youth Movements*, appearing in *Commentary*, June, 1969, pointed out:

"Youth movements have always been extreme, emotional, enthusiastic; they have never been moderate or rational . . . the established order is corrupt to the bones and beyond redemption of parliamentary means of reform. The ideologies of democracy and liberalism have always been seen as an irretrievable part of the whole rotten system."

Laqueur further commented that violent activism by youth has been a recurring incident in history but that,

"Youth movements have come and gone, but never before has one been taken so seriously. Never in the past has an older generation been so disconcerted by the onslaught of the young."

The mature leaders of youth were given great blame by Laqueur:

"The doctors of the American youth movement are in fact a part of its disease. They have helped to generate a great deal of passion . . . but they have failed to produce a single new idea . . . the historical memory of a generation does not usually extend back very far . . . but their mentors do remember, and their betrayal of memory cannot be forgiven."

The participants in youth movements have always had a divine belief in their own infallibility and an equal mistrust of the will of the majority, as exemplified by their elders. This unbalanced thinking of youth movements creates a philosophy opposed to democracy or legal procedures, and when aided and abetted by conniving, vicious, and selfish leaders, has often led youth to the belief that they must rely on violence to reach their objectives.

What are these objectives? What are the yearnings that so trouble these violent young people that to obtain them all loyalties to family, friends, school and country must be forgotten? Obscenity, vulgarity, and immorality become a way of life, and destruction of everything that has been considered good and decent becomes a compulsion. What are the objectives for which these young violent radicals are willing to give so much?

Apologists for the student protests are inclined to believe that all of them are youths' way of crying out against the Vietnamese War. This is not true. Of all the student protest demonstrations at U.S. institutions of learning reported in 1967 and 1968, there were 27 different issues, only 38% of which were concerned with U.S. policy in Vietnam. One of the first of the recent violent student protests took place in 1964-1965 at Berkeley under the so-called "Freedom of Speech Movement." Perhaps the most violent of all occurred at Columbia University in April and May, 1968, at a time when the U.S. was suffering severe casualties and was rapidly escalating our military forces in Vietnam and bombing the North Vietnamese. However, the alleged reason for the anti-Columbia riots was not the war but to stop construction of a gymnasium at Morningside Heights.

Other principles which were of such overriding importance that a number of students felt they could be settled only by violence and destruction and therefore became the focal point of at least one riot were:

1. Dormitory and other living-group relations, including womens' hours and bedroom visitation rights.
2. Civil rights in several explicit as well as vague areas.
3. The draft.
4. On-campus recruiting by the armed forces.
5. On-campus recruiting by various industrial and commercial concerns.
6. Classified defense and related research on campus.
7. Basis for grades (students were demanding that grades be given without exams being taken, University of Maryland 1970).
8. Type of observance to be held in relation to the death of Martin Luther King, Princeton, 1968.
9. An autonomous College of Afro-American Studies at Cornell University; when this was turned down, students armed with rifles and shotguns seized Willard Hall (1969).
10. Elimination of ROTC and ROTC scholarships, 1968-69.
11. Reduction of rent of Harvard-owned apartments, 1968-69.
12. Demolition of Harvard-owned build-

ings and homes for expansion of university physical plant, 1968-69.

13. Pending Black Panther trial, particularly violent at Yale University, 1970.

14. Altercation between part-time coach and black athlete, San Fernando Valley State College, 1969.

15. Behavior of coaches, San Jose State and Oregon State, 1968.

16. Fifteen separate demands, all hinging on problems related to open admission for black students, black teachers, black studies, San Francisco State College, 1968-69.

It is especially significant that of the most violent demonstrations purporting to be over the Vietnamese War have taken place in 1970 at a time when the U.S. is rapidly pulling our troops out of the War. Only the naive would doubt that a force dedicated to the destruction—not the remoulding—of the United States as a country of free men is behind these riots. But students have always been naive, haven't they?

Many of the violent youth, when confronted with responsibility in later life, will become worthy members of society. I recall an incident in a law suit many years ago when a famous old trial lawyer, in attempting to explain the actions of certain youth, quoted the following poem:

*King Solomon and King David led merry,
merry lives,
They had many, many concubines and many,
many wives.
But when old age o'er took them with its
many qualms,
King Solomon wrote the Proverbs and King
David wrote the Psalms.*

We can only hope that when those who have joined today's campus riots just to be in the "in" group, as many of them have, reach the age of writing proverbs and psalms, they will have a free press in which to publish them.

DISSENT AND THE MOB

To dissent, to disagree, is and always must be the right of free men. The reconciling of disagreement is one of the fundamental purposes of government. To be able to reconcile these differences properly and fairly demands from government the best, the most capable and fairest of leadership. In discussing dissent, it is important that legal dissent in no way be confused with violence. The conflict in government between protecting the lives, rights, and property of the citizens and also protecting the citizen against the regimentation and repression of the state always presents a problem. In the United States we have a government that protects the individual both against the violence of his fellowman, and from the tyranny of the majority. The battle to obtain for men the freedom and protection he has in America today has been bloody and has taken centuries to accomplish. Among the milestones in that progressive battle we find the Assize of Clarendon of 1166; the Magna Charta of 1215; the Mayflower Compact of 1620; the Habeas Corpus Act of 1679; the American Declaration of Independence of 1776; and the Constitution (and the Bill of Rights) of 1787 and 1791. Gladstone, the great British Prime Minister, said that the United States' Constitution was the greatest work ever produced by the mind of man.

A mob throwing rocks at policemen, smashing windows, burning and looting, all in the name of dissent does not prove that these dissenters are right or just. "There is no tyranny more vicious than the tyranny of the mob." Such a mob is usually an infinitesimal minority attempting to overcome the will of the majority.

The greatest and most important method of dissent is one that can be resorted to only in free countries: the free and secret ballot. No Communist country or other country ruled by a dictator has the ballot as a weapon of dissent. If the citizens of Communist

countries had this weapon then Communist tyranny of today would be at an end. It is this method of dissent—the ballot—that has allowed mankind to grow in knowledge, to achieve his progress and greatness. This secret ballot, as long as he can retain it, keeps government responsive to his will.

It is interesting that the mobs on the campuses and in the streets, the promoters of violence, have never demonstrated an interest in the use of their right of the secret ballot. They repudiate the ballot and encourage its demise.

Mob action is an acknowledgment that the members of the mob are in the minority and that they are espousing a cause that is contrary to the law or is opposed by the majority. Otherwise, they would not have resorted to mob action; they would be resorting to recognized procedures. The action of the mob is an attempt to destroy legal procedures, and any yielding to that mob is yielding to blackmail; the experience of the ages has proven that such yielding brings only more vicious blackmail. Mob action in a democracy is never justified.

A mob has no reason. It is usually instigated by vicious, conniving and evil persons. Such has been the making of "lynch-law," which at times has disgraced most of the countries of the world. In the whirlwind action of the mob, many innocent people are swept forward by the unreasoning waves of passion. Untold numbers of emotional, naive and easily led people, both youth and adults, have become participants of the mob, and as a result, they have been maimed or killed, often unaware of the vicious goals motivating the instigators of the mob. Many unthinkingly have gone along with the mob, and consequently have become criminals, and others have spent much of their lives in remorse for having been a participant of mob action.

Today, as in the past, the mobs on the campus and in the streets are directed by the enemies of our country and society, who, when seeing their goal of a takeover or of destruction thwarted, have directed and goaded a mob to do their will. They, however, are well in the background when the hour of confrontation comes between the mob and the reality of lawful force. Only the naive doubt that Communists and others of the "hate America" breed are active in "turning on the hate" and promoting their anti-American mobs.

The real enemies of the youth of today are those in authority who either encourage or permit the violence, rock throwing, burning and disruption of classes and of law and order.

HISTORY OF CAMPUS VIOLENCE

Campus violence has occurred throughout the ages. History gives us many student movements of violence. We have the filthy, bearded Cynics and the Sophists of the Third and Fourth Centuries of Rome, both decaying versions of their earlier Greek counterparts. They were anti-government and anti-society. These Cynics and Sophists, by working as termites within the social, economic, and political structure of Rome, contributed greatly to Rome's fall to the barbarians. Today's Weathermen (splinter group of the Students for a Democratic Society) at their "War Council" in Flint, Michigan, December 27-30, 1969, placed themselves with pride in a role similar to the barbarian tribes who invaded and destroyed Rome.

Will Durant's description of the Cynics of that time and place:

"Their tattered cloak, their unkempt hair and beard, their wallet and staff, their reduction of life to simplicities, sometimes obscenities. They lived like mendicant friars, had a hierarchical organization with novices and superiors, avoided marriage and work, scorned the conventions and artificialities of civilization, denounced all governments as

thieves and superfluities, laughed at all oracles, 'mysteries,' and gods."

Sounds familiar, doesn't it? The ancestors of Haight-Ashbury inhabitants in San Francisco, or any of the gamier stew in the cities where they congregate today; yes, Greece and Rome had them too, this incipient SDS.

The Dark Ages lightened somewhat; cultural life in Europe picked up and improved; universities were established, and what do we find? A writer complained about students at Oxford, England, during the 13th and 14th centuries "atrociously wounding and slaying many, carrying off women, ravishing virgins, committing robberies and many other enormities hateful to God."

These students and their nonstudent "vagrants" openly ridiculed the police just as the students of the New Left do today.

The students at Oxford of that day were from wealthy homes, and on the campus they enjoyed privileged sanctuaries immune from arrest for lawlessness. These students could not be tried for crimes they committed in the courts where the common people were tried.

And, as today, faculty often joined in, lending a spurious air of legitimacy to the whole mess. Governor Reagan of California was lately castigated sharply for speaking of student violence and inferring that if they wanted a bloodbath, then let it come. Governor Reagan was anticipated by almost 600 years. Oxford, in 1354, got sick of it all, and an outraged citizenry (the "town") took up arms, quite literally, against Oxford (the "gown"). What has gone into the history books as the Battle of Saint Scholastica's Day, in 1354, ended with outright slaughter of trouble-making Oxford students:

"For today the mob rioted and pillaged and slew . . . when the pillage was over, the university had vanished, seemingly never to return."

Today, in some Latin American countries, student violence has practically destroyed some of the larger universities. Many have allowed the university campus to become a privileged sanctuary for criminals, similar to the objectives demanded by the SDS and the other New Left professors and students in the U.S. As some of the South American universities have become ineffective as learning centers because of crime and violence, the government has at times resorted to the use of police and the army to restore them to their legitimate function.

All free countries today are suffering student riots and protests. France, who has had her share of revolutionary youths, received a strong dose in May, 1968, when Daniel Cohn-Bendit, better known as Red Danny, manned the barricades, wrecked some of the universities, and for a time paralyzed the government. He, as his "allies" in the U.S. such as the SDS, had an especially deep hatred of the trade unions as they couldn't help him to totally wreck France. Rudi Dutschke (Red Rudi) attempted the same violence in Germany with somewhat less success. Both were closely associated with our violence students in America and their elder activists such as Marcuse.

Our problems of campus violence in America are similar to those which exist in most countries of the free world. Our problems in America are increased and further compounded by our much greater wealth and opportunities which allow a segment of youth to envision a lifetime ahead without the necessity of any useful or remunerative endeavor. All are enjoying a higher degree of prosperity and freedom than ever existed before. The universities today contain many students who should never have gone to a university because they lack the mental, emotional, and moral fiber to profit from higher learning. Allowed to run wild by our affluent and permissive society, these youths have developed a life in which motivation or sense of responsibility have been replaced by a hatred of country, school, society, father,

and themselves. Adolescence, that period between childhood and maturity, should always be a vital period of life, but it has become lusterless to many of the young people because of their lack of challenges, goals and responsibility; as a result, many extend that normally brief period of adolescence many years, at times into middle age, still searching vaguely for what they missed.

This extended adolescence has developed a queer breed of juvenile delinquents. The heroes they worship are Che Guevara, Castro, and Mao Tse-tung, each of whom dedicated his life to the destruction of democracy.

This "artificial" adolescent too often today comes under the guidance of an incompetent or vicious type of college professor totally lacking in dedication to learning. Such a professor hides his inferiority in teaching by surrendering to or encouraging campus violence and often imitates the beatnik youth in dress, manners and filth of mind and body. This alliance of mentally immature students and unsavory educators produces a small but loud and dangerous swarm of termites sowing the seeds of anarchy in our schools.

Violence and riots are not new on the campuses or in the universities either in Europe or the United States. Scores of such incidents have been recorded such as in 1834 when President Quincy of Harvard banished the entire sophomore class for a year. One of the great difficulties we have today in solving such problems is a lack of courage and decision by the administration and faculty when faced with campus violence.

VIOLENT RUSSIAN STUDENT MOVEMENTS

While student movements of violence have been a recurring pattern in history, the so-called "Russian Student Movement" bears such a close resemblance to our student violence in America that it deserves a closer study by our schools and government.

The "Russian Student Movement" generally covers a half century period from 1856, just after the Crimean War, to 1905. This movement, in common with most student movements of violence, actually was an aid to reaction and failed to develop the slightest trend toward democracy. It was an impassioned movement with an almost religious zeal; yet it was above, not of the people. It was a self-styled elite movement and never demonstrated any confidence in either the worker or the peasant. A half century of Russian student activism certainly was revolutionary, but it lacked any overtones of liberalism or democracy.

The violence of this movement extended to the assassination of many government officials, even to Tsar Alexander II in 1881. Suicides became prevalent among the youth of Russia, and motiveless terror became a symbol of the movement. The students threatened and planned to blow up entire cities, and the bomb became the weapon of the violent student groups who circulated instruction sheets on the construction of "home-made" bombs.

The parallel here is particularly pertinent: the violent student activists in the United States also are distributing to high school and university students a pamphlet (a copy of which I have in my possession) containing a "short course" in making bombs and in destroying buildings and people. This copy was distributed within the cover of the New Left Notes, the national magazine of the SDS.

The pamphlet lists chemicals to purchase that will not arouse suspicion, and gives detailed instructions, complete with photographs and diagrams, for the manufacture of both concussion and incendiary bombs of varying sizes, small enough to be carried in the pocket or large enough to destroy buildings and designed to explode after the arsonist or bomber has left the premises. Final instructions are "remain out of jail in order

to be able to strike again, and again, and again."

Russian historians unanimously agree that the student violence, bombing and killing of that day greatly retarded much meaningful progress toward reforms and set back for many years the obtaining of a constitution for the Russian people. Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Friedrich Engels (1825-1895), as well as the great Russian radical leader, anarchist and freedom fighter, Peter Kropotkin (1842-1921), also agree with that conclusion. Kropotkin also added that acceptance of a constitution was extremely near when, by a student plot, a bomb ended the life of Alexander II on March 1, 1881.

Lewis S. Feuer, in *The Conflict of Generations*, states:

"Perhaps the deepest failure of the Russian student movement was that characteristic of almost all student movements—it failed to develop a devotion to liberal values and liberal democracy. The immense forces of idealism which it released were combined with all the marks of generational politics—arrogance, the conviction that the generational perspective alone grasped the truth, physical rejection of the elders, impatience, the propensity for violence . . . The student movement had no more regard for academic freedom than did the Czar's government; it was determined to enforce its will as far as it could against critics, conservatives and reactionaries alike.

"When the Bolshevik Revolution, however, finally took place, the students stood back perturbed and bewildered. They seemed at the least to realize that the contempt for rational liberal values brought with it inevitable consequences—contempt for individual rights, a party and personal dictatorship, mass terrorism, anti-intellectualism. The next Russian student movement born in a Soviet world would have to grope for its return to liberalism."

THE CATECHISM OF THE REVOLUTIONARY

"The Catechism of the Revolutionary," written in the spring of 1869 by Bakunin and Nechayev, which became the "Bible" of the Russian youthful activists, bears a startling resemblance to the philosophy of the violent student New Left in the United States today as can be seen in the following:

"There is only one science for the revolutionary, the science of destruction.

"He (the revolutionary) scorns all doctrines and renounces culture and learning . . . He despises and hates the prevailing moral code in all its manifestations. Anything assisting the triumph of the revolution is for him moral, anything hindering it is immoral and criminal . . . All the gentle and enfeebling sentiments of kinship, love, gratitude and even honor must be suppressed . . . The true revolutionary is, by his very nature, immune from romanticism, exaltation, rapture."

The Catechism also goes into detail as to how the whole evil society is to be disposed of. One category is to be condemned to immediate death. Another category of high ranking persons is to be "inveigled into positions where they become embroiled in dirty affairs. Then they can be harnessed to our cause, and their power, influence and capital will become an inexhaustible treasurehouse for all our undertakings."

Another category consists of liberals of all shades.

"The revolutionary must join them and pretend to collaborate with them in their programs until he gets hold of all their secrets and they are completely in our hands."

Nechayev declared that it would be the worst thing that could happen if the government lowered taxes and lightened the burden of the peasants. Their lot should not be improved, the Catechism declared, and explained why:

"We are convinced that the tolling masses

can achieve complete freedom and happiness only through an all-embracing destructive popular revolution, and therefore we will work with all our power and all our means to foster the spread of oppression and evil, until they break the patience of the people and force them to a general revolt."

The "Patron Saint" of the New Left, Dr. Herbert Marcuse of the University of California, San Diego branch, expressed the same philosophy one hundred years later. He strongly condemned the American free enterprise system because, in his own words, "It delivers the goods." In his book, *One Dimensional Man*, he attacked the American system, especially organized labor as a part of that system because it has produced man's natural needs in abundance, enabling man to rise from poverty, thus causing him to "abandon the revolution."

Nechayev and his disciples were not against the State order; they were only against the authority of others. They were autocrats aiming at establishing their own autocracy under the slogan of freedom, since this was the only battle-cry by which they could hope to achieve their aim. The dictatorship they would establish would be justified, they felt because with their decrees they would bring happiness to the people, a fair exchange for freedom.

Nechayev declared it an impossibility that the masses themselves could find their own way to happiness and justice by their own efforts. "The people cannot deliver themselves," he said. "Left to themselves, they would never be able to shape their fate according to their real needs." They had to be led to their happiness, and this was the task of the revolutionary intellectuals. The masses should therefore not be instructed and educated, he declared, because the more primitive they were, the more readily would they follow and obey.

AGING ACTIVISTS AND STUDENT ANARCHY, UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA

The Russian student violence of yesterday, as the student violence of the United States today, had its aging activists and would-be philosophers who encouraged youth to violence. An excellent example is the Russian anarchist Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876) who stated:

"The road to revolution should be paved by the revolt of the great mass . . . and in the dedicated community of irreconcilable youth."

And Professor Herbert Marcuse, of the University of California, San Diego Branch, in the 1960's:

"The Marxist idea of socialism is not radical enough . . . we must develop the moral, sexual rebellion of the youth."

These aging activists, interestingly enough, are often involved in homosexuality. The sexually impotent Bakunin, long a world hero among revolutionaries, became a simple fool in the hands of the vicious, blackmailing and unscrupulous revolutionary Russian student leader, Sergi Nechayev (1847-1882).

Bakunin allowed his attraction to student activist movements to become his political downfall. At 55 he was still a "homeless, wandering student, a pitiful figure."

Apparently Professor Herbert Marcuse, the idol of student anarchists of today is in his declining years, stumbling and tottering toward the same end of other aging would-be leaders of student activists. The New Republic of March 29, 1969, carried a review by Kenneth Boulding of Marcuse's recent book, *An Essay on Liberation*:

"It would be easy to make fun of Marcuse's liberation, for it seems to be liberation from soap, from fathers, from work, from the beastly world of productivity, and exchange; and indeed it is hard to avoid visualizing Marcusean man as the remittance man of the cartoons, lounging away his life in idol fantasies on a Tahitian beach.

"I am afraid my verdict on this essay is

that it is nonsense, not even attractive nonsense. The 'great refusal' which Marcuse talks about in the rebelling young is, one fears, almost identical with the great refusal of Peter Pan."

Paul Goodman, the middle-aged gadfly, today travels from campus to campus in the United States encouraging the student juvenile delinquents to violence and seeming intent on publicity displaying his flagging intellectual powers. In a television program with Stokely Carmichael in 1967, when racial problems were being discussed, Goodman's contribution to this discussion was on the "humiliation and resentment of the homosexual."

These aging ex-students, both of Russia of the last century and of the United States today, are a serious problem on campus; they never grew up. They never utilized the knowledge gained as students to assume their place and responsibility in society.

HISTORY OF VIOLENCE—ANARCHY

We find in the experience of the past a clear description of the problems of today. However, in our national egotism, we tend to believe the problems we have are unique. Carved in granite on the front of the great National Archives Building on Constitution Avenue in Washington are these words: "Study the past. What is past is prologue." So let us study the past in order to understand the violent youth of today.

The waves of violence sweeping the free world, the violence threatening our country and society, is anarchy. Anarchy is not new. We find a vivid description of anarchy given 24 centuries ago by the Greek playwright Sophocles:

There lives no greater fiend than Anarchy; She ruins states, turns houses out of doors.

Anarchy is as old as men's experiences in living together. The word anarchy is derived from the Greek "anarchia" which literally means "without a leader; complete absence of government or law; political disorder and violence."

Anarchy is the absence of government, a state of society where there is no direction of the activities of the people therein.

To the immature and the naive, the idea of no government might, at first glance, be said to have certain attractions since the necessity of living under a ruling government has always meant repression to one degree or another. No one within a community has the absolute right to do whatever he pleases, whenever he pleases. This would seem to be self-evident to all thinking persons. Yet reams of paper have been covered with the scribbles of political philosophers who railed against any and all authority and constantly maintained that man could realize his destiny only in a totally free and unfettered atmosphere. But they made one very grave error that has ever since compounded, confused, and contradicted the issue. They have confused liberty with license. The gulf between the two yawns wide as the pit itself and has also swallowed up those who failed to see the difference. Total abolition of authority and government also means total loss of protection for rights, safety, or property of the individual.

Every civilization, society or culture has lurking within itself a force which, if allowed to develop and grow unrestrained, would ultimately destroy it. That force is the small but devastating germ of anarchy, the termite that if allowed to grow would destroy law and order, government and civilization itself. The law of the jungle would prevail. Hatred would replace love. Violence would replace peace. Fear would replace confidence. Chaos would replace order, and anarchy would become the order of the day.

LACK OF DISCIPLINE—ROOT OF ANARCHY

Every parent knows that a child has no inborn respect for the rights of others. It is

only by example and training that a child grows into a respectful, useful and worthy citizen having a wholesome respect for the rights of others. It is unfortunate, however that in our society we have and will always have members who observe the rights of others only under fear of punishment. To permit these persons to violate the rights of their fellowmen with impunity encourages others to follow that same path, causing a breakdown of law and order.

Discipline of body and mind has been a directing force in man's movement forward and upward from the Stone Age. It is discipline that changes chaos into order—whether it is chaos and confusion in mind, body or society.

No one ever achieved real success as a teacher or athlete, scholar or humanitarian, in business or in the professions, as a technician or scientist, as a homemaker or citizen until he achieved some discipline of mind and body. It is unfortunate that the violent students and others of the New Left of today have so bitterly and persistently attacked the word "discipline" that this word has among many parents, teachers, and officials achieved an evil connotation. Too many fail to realize that discipline involves the respecting of the rights of others.

It is the paramount duty of parents, teachers and all public officials to assist society and especially youth in acquiring both mental and physical discipline that permits the greatest development. No one, even the lawless, respects the individual, the organization, the government or society that does not demand order, the order that results from mental, moral and physical discipline. Such is a base of respect. Any government or social order that permits each individual to do as he pleases without regard for the rights of others loses respect and eventually the power to maintain order. Such permissiveness by the individual, the home, the school or the state will bring on disorder, then chaos and finally anarchy. The defense against anarchy is discipline—voluntary discipline through the respect and concern for the rights of others—involuntary discipline enforced by law and force when voluntary discipline is refused. If the only discipline a youth or adult will get is through force, then society must use the only medium he can understand—that is force. The violent student, despite his bravado and world threats and pretended great courage, dislikes going to jail as much as others do. This force may teach him discipline, but if not, the force can at least protect decent society from him and maintain order.

Mohandas K. Gandhi the Indian apostle of peaceful revolution in behalf of the majority, gave the world a clear charge concerning the use of force for self protection:

"He who cannot protect himself or his nearest and dearest or their honor by non-violently facing death; may and ought to do so by violently dealing with the oppressor. He who can do neither of the two is a burden. He has no business to be head of a family. He must either hide himself, or must rest content to live forever in helplessness and be prepared to crawl like a worm at the bidding of a bully."

AFTER ANARCHY, WHAT?

History presents us with a recurring pattern of violence replacing law and order, of anarchy then becoming the order of the day, then of despair when a frantic people fearful of the destruction of themselves and family, finally turn to a tyrant who promises to restore law and order but himself becomes a dictator.

After the French Revolution, the French people confused license with liberty. A reign of terror became the order of the day, violence replaced law and order, anarchy reigned. To provide order, a new government came into being. Napoleon, the man on the white horse, gained control, and man had

law and order, but not liberty and freedom. The man on horseback founded a dictatorship more ruthless than that of Louis XVI.

There was an analogous situation in Russia. In April, 1917, taking advantage of the failure of the new Provisional Government to bring law and order, Lenin, making great promises of freedom, with an initial force of less than 15,000 followers aided by the mob, overthrew the government by armed force.

Tyranny has replaced violence and that tyranny is still in control. Millions have been killed, imprisoned and banished in Russia and her satellite nations to keep that iron control of mind and body by the Kremlin. The most bitter attacks on the Communist government have been written by those who were the greatest proponents of Sovietism when it first came into power, such as Peter Kropotkin, Emma Goldman, and Andrew Berkman.

We have a later example in Germany of violence by several groups endangering law and order, of that violence growing into anarchy, and of that anarchy being replaced by a dictatorial tyranny. In Germany after World War I, the Neue Schar was organized, consisting of members with long hair and filthy dress, advocating free love and distributing great masses of flowers. By 1932, the young German Republic was attacked by wild-eyed young revolutionaries very similar to the hippies and far left youths in the United States today. They were going to "man the barricades." They terrorized the public and generally brought chaos to government.

There was another group of youth in Germany who, to gain acceptance and control, promised law and order, a government to protect the citizens from the violent and anti-government forces, the "New Left" of Germany of that day. This new government burned the books, and terrorized professors in "goosestepping" Hitler into power. So Nazi Germany was born from the anarchy of violent youth.

Both of these violent youth organizations—both the left and the right—were against democracy. Both believed government must be of the elite and that they were the elite. Soon the leftist, the hippie-type, had been killed or were in concentration camps, and the tyranny of Hitler did not end until VE Day in 1945.

The replacement of violence and anarchy by dictatorial tyranny has repeated itself in a monotonous pattern throughout history. After tyranny replaces anarchy, the whims of the dictator become the law and order of the day. If and when history repeats itself, if and when an outraged and fearful citizenry takes violent action to protect itself from violence, then in remembrance, the stern college dean, the tough cop, and the Judge Julius Hoffmans of the Federal District Court in Chicago, will appear as kind guardian angels.

We must never allow violence and anarchy to get such a foothold in America that an outraged citizenry will allow retaliation by the vigilantes. Yes, it can happen here and it will happen here, unless we recognize that men can be free only in a society of law and order and then maintain that law and order.

After anarchy replaces law, and the tyrant replaces anarchy, then man begins his long walk back to the freedom and dignity he knew before he allowed anarchy to take over. The road to freedom and liberty is always a long and rugged road, fraught with blood, sweat and tears. When violence and chaos took over after the fall of Rome, it was a thousand years before man began to regain the freedom and dignity that was his before he allowed anarchy to replace law and order.

TODAY'S DEPRAVITY AND STUDENT VIOLENCE IS BOILING

When the pot boils, the scum rises to the top. The pot certainly is boiling on our campuses and the streets. The scum is coming to

the top. Violence and arson would replace tolerance, reason, and scholastic endeavor.

To the New Left student activists, literature would be expressed in obscene and lecherous pictures and writings where the four-letter word "Work" is evil and to be avoided. The promotion of the use of drugs to degrade others as well as themselves is encouraged.

These people use art and music to record the filth of the gutters; pornography, crude and repulsive, is a tool in the planned program of degrading love and sex. All officials, government and school, who would protect the rights and freedom of the people, are "fascist pigs."

Similar debasement was viewed with pride by the violent students of Russia in the last century. The reasoning and philosophy leading to active campaigns by the "New Left" to degrade society is difficult for the normal person to comprehend. A possible explanation has been given in Russian literature.

The Russian novelist, Fedor Dostoyevsky (1821-1881) writing about the philosophy of the youthful student anarchists in his novel, *The Possessed*. Quoting one of the characters, Peter Berkhovensky:

"We don't want education. We have had enough science . . . The thing we want is obedience . . . The desire for education is an aristocratic desire. The moment a man falls in love or has the desire for a family, he gets the desire for private property. We will destroy that desire; we'll resort to unheard of depravity; we shall smother every genius in infancy."

The Russian student violence of the last century made a cult of self-destruction and terrorism. Politics to them became parricide, regicide, and suicide. They formed a terroristic band which they called HELL.

To secure money, one member of the organization was to poison his father. Another was to steal from the mail, while another was to rob a merchant. One rational student, Nikolai Nozhin, a brilliant young scientist, attempted to dissuade the circle from violence; he was found murdered in his room the night before Karakozov, according to plan, made his attempt on the life of the Tsar.

The Russian novelist, Maxim Gorki, observing a student terrorist who had assassinated a governor, commented:

"His person gives forth the strong and suffocating odor of an imbecile . . . That ass feels himself satisfied as if he had accomplished something which everybody in the world would recognize as important and useful."

Many sincere people in America, while disapproving of the violence of the "freedom of speech" movement at Berkeley, had the belief that there was some worthy motive behind the violence. They were surprised when it was found later that common crime, such as larceny, rape, embezzlement, and purse snatching, went hand-in-hand with the Berkeley violence.

When the "bomb factory" operated by the Weathermen faction of the SDS blew up in Greenwich Village on March 7, 1970, killing Theodore Gold and two of his cohorts, stolen women's purses were found in the ruins of the building. These anarchists were also common thieves. Many of the New Left promote the use of drugs among the high schools and university students today because drugs contribute greatly to depravity, and depravity is one of their ablest recruiters.

PROFESSORS OF ANARCHY

Those responsible for the tyranny of youth who encourage revolutionary changes, who neglect or refuse to enforce discipline are deserving of the title "Professor of Anarchy."

Those not of the "gown," but who condone or encourage violence of youth and attack schools, public officials, judges and police who attempt to bring order out of the chaos in

the campus and the streets are equally deserving of the dubious honor of "Accessories to Anarchy." It is these Professors, Accessories to Anarchy, who are primarily to blame for the growing violence among American youth.

Abolition of authority on a national scale is but a larger extension of rebellion against discipline in the home and the school. It is unsettling in the extreme to read of this, and it is worse yet to read of its encouragement as well. A recent glaring example that has to date been denounced on virtually every newspaper editorial page, ranging from the New York Times and the Washington Post to the Wall Street Journal and the Chicago Tribune, is the height of irresponsibility reached by the President of Yale University, and also that university's chaplain.

The President of Yale, Kingman Brewster, pouring gasoline on the smoldering fires already started by his students over the forthcoming Black Panther trial, observed that he was skeptical of the ability of black revolutionaries to achieve a fair trial anywhere in the United States. The Chaplain of Yale, William Sloan Coffin, said that the trial was "legally right but morally wrong." However, Connecticut Superior Court Judge Herbert S. MacDonald observed, quite correctly, that any impediments to a fair trial for the Black Panthers come in large measure from their champions. "They are the ones who have created the atmosphere of which they now complain," he said, "and I include Kingman Brewster in that category."

President Brewster's earlier actions raise a question as to his motives. While a student at Yale in February, 1941, he testified before a Congressional committee against the Defense Act of 1941, whose purpose was to supply arms and supplies to Britain and the rest of Europe to help stall the Nazi plan to rule the world. If Brewster's confidence in our ability to get along with Hitler had prevailed, Hitler's Third Reich would probably extend today from Spain to Siberia, and from Norway to the Near East, with all of its resulting terror.

The Administration at Harvard University has displayed a special ability for encouraging campus anarchy. Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara was invited to speak at Harvard. As he was leaving, violent students attacked his car, beating him over the head with a club. He was saved by the arrival of the Cambridge Police. Dean Munro of Harvard refused to, as he termed it, "punish students for what was purely a political activity."

Al Capp later commented on Dean Munro's actions:

"Now if depriving a man of his freedom to speak, if depriving him of his freedom to move, if damn near depriving him of his life—if that's political activity, then rape is a social event and sticking up a gas station is a financial transaction."

Dr. James A. Perkins, ex-president of Cornell University, should receive an award of "A" in excellence for encouraging campus anarchy; as told by The National Observer:

"For about 30 minutes . . . Cornell's President, Dr. James A. Perkins . . . denied even the courtesy of a chair by militant students, sat on the floor of the stage in Barton Hall, the University Field House, red-faced, humiliated, and sipping a can of root beer."

That really shocking, unbelievable part of the act took place, however, after the 30-minute lecture by the militants to the President, when Dr. Perkins got to his feet and discussed the event at Cornell as "the most constructive move that the University has ever taken."

Yes, we have many Professors of Anarchy in America. Some wear the "cap and gown" in our schools, but many others, some of whom are fugitives, deserve this rank. Among them are the Jerry Rubins, Mark Rudds, Tom Haydens, and Bernadine Dohrns, and some scores of others who have carved a record of

infamy on our campuses. Also deserving of this dubious "honor" are the purveyors of hate and destruction among our New Left and in our communications media who attack the courageous public servants, policemen, and judges who are attempting to stem this growing violence.

Perhaps the saddest cases are those college professors, deans, administrators, and presidents who can see nothing wrong with violence as long as it is committed by students.

Theodore Gold, age 21, was active in the violent disruption at Columbia University in April and May, 1968, violence which was tolerated by a weak and cowardly faculty and administration. In the early morning hours of May 21, 1968, Gold led the singing in barricaded Hamilton Hall at Columbia, chanting: "There will be no New York Times where I am bound," and the prophetic line, "Che (Guevara) will be waiting for me where I am bound."

It was but a few steps from Gold's violence at Columbia to his flaming demise at age 23 when his "bomb factory" blew up in Greenwich Village on March 7, 1970. Every step of this road to anarchy was made easier and encouraged by the permissiveness, tolerance, and even encouragement of the "bleeding hearts," the "worshippers of puberty," and the "leftist establishment" in America. In his earlier life, Gold displayed a kindness and compassion to his fellowman. There is reason to believe that with proper discipline and restraint, Theodore Gold would have been a useful member of society instead of suffering an anarchistic death—killed by his own bomb.

WHO ARE THESE ANARCHISTS?

Let us name a few of the leaders of this anarchy whose names are already household words in America. The following ten are outstanding in anarchy and in the public eye: Tom Hayden, 29; Jerry Rubin, 31; Rennie Davis, 29; Abbie Hoffman, 31; Mark Rudd, 22; Bernadine Dohrn, 28; William Ayers, 29; Kathy Boudin, 26; Howard Machtinger, 23; and John Jacobs, 22.

There are many other such students and ex-students of violence, but the record of the above ten will suffice to clarify this permissiveness on the part of the school and public officials. These students, or generally ex-students, have not only committed and encouraged anarchy in the schools and streets, but their names have become a symbol of violence throughout our country.

These youthful leaders of violence have been involved in "hate America" campaigns throughout the country, and although young in years, they have made a lurid career of violence.

Hayden, Davis, Rubin and Hoffman, members of the "Chicago Seven," were convicted and sentenced to long terms in prison on February 20, 1970, after a five month trial in the court of Judge Julius Hoffman in Chicago. That trial was punctuated by violence to a degree heretofore unknown by the defendants and their friends in, and outside the courtroom. They are each now free under bond, daily making incendiary speeches throughout America, often at institutions supported by public tax money, encouraging the destruction of our schools, government, and society. They tell you what they are going to do.

Tom Hayden, one of the founders of the Students for a Democratic Society, was an activist in the violence at Berkeley (1964-65) and helped bring Columbia University to its knees in April and May of 1968. Hayden laid a pattern for campus violence and revolution in two widely quoted statements. He said the only university they would accept is:

"A university committed against the value of American society or no university at all."

When asked the purpose of the revolution, Hayden responded:

"We haven't any. First we will make the revolution; then we will find out what for."

Every act of these leaders of student violence has been compatible with that statement.

Jerry Rubin, a notorious anti-American zealot and organizer of the Youth International Party (Yippies) and also one of those convicted in "Chicago 7," clearly expressed the hatred for the United States by the New Left and its plan to destroy it. The plan is blunt and leaves little to the imagination.

"While it (the U.S.) is overextended defending American influence overseas, we are chipping away here. Yippies are chipping away, blacks are chipping away, the enemy overseas is chipping away. If you keep on hitting The Man from every side, punching him, laughing at him, ridiculing him, he will eventually collapse. That's what is going to happen to America."

Mark Rudd, who was a leader of the April-May, 1968, violence that wrecked Columbia University, in one of the most violent and obscene letters ever written to a university president, wrote to Grayson Kirk:

"We will take control of your world . . . your university . . . your power is directly threatened since we will have to destroy that power before we take over . . . There is only one thing left to say, up against the wall, m—f—, this is a stickup."

Rudd has been arrested many times, and had fled and failed to appear in Criminal Court in Chicago on April 6, 1970, the date his case was set for trial. He was ordered arrested and could not be found, but the \$2,500 bond was returned to his father. As a result of an indictment returned in a Federal District Court in Chicago on April 1, 1970, (other than the scheduled appearance on April 6 on another charge) Rudd is now a fugitive from justice, along with Bernadine Dohrn, William Ayers, Kathy Boudin, Howard Machtinger and John Jacobs, most of whom are members of the "Weatherman" faction of the SDS.

What did these youthful ex-students do in Chicago to cause this indictment. Their own press stated it as follows:

"Five hundred of us moved through the richest sections of Chicago, with VC flags in front, smashing luxury apartment windows and store fronts, ripping apart the Loop, and injuring scores of pigs (extremist term for police). It was war—we knew it and the pigs knew it."

Bernadine Dohrn and Kathy Boudin were with Theodore Gold and two others on March 7, 1970, when their "bomb factory" in a Greenwich Village townhouse exploded. Dohrn and Boudin escaped. Much of the violence in Chicago that resulted in the April 1 indictment was planned by Bernadine Dohrn, Gold and others when they had met in Cuba with Communist leaders from North Vietnam, Cuba and Red China.

Later at a meeting in Flint, Michigan, December 27-30 1969, referred to as the Weatherman "Council of War," a large supply of dynamite was obtained. This was a meeting of hatred. They glorified Sirhan Sirhan, assassin of Robert Kennedy, as they did Charles Manson, the accused murderer of actress Sharon Tate and her friends. To glorify these murderers they would chant, "Sirhan Sirhan Power" and "Charlie Manson Power." Bernadine Dohrn, formerly national secretary of the SDS, in glorifying the Tate murder at the Flint meeting said:

"Dig it, first they killed those pigs (Sharon Tate and her friends), then they ate dinner in the same room with them, then they even shoved a fork into a victim's stomach! Wild!"

At the "Council of War" in Flint, John Jacobs proudly announced:

"We are against everything that is good and decent."

MASSIVE PERMISSIVENESS

Never in history has a country shown such permissiveness to violence and destruction as has the United States today to our anarchistic students. It is also academic that nothing

could so encourage increased violence as does this permissiveness.

Hundreds of schools of higher learning within the last two years have been damaged to the extent of millions of dollars, and hundreds are temporarily closed. At times these schools have been paralyzed from this violence. Insurance rates for school buildings have been increased often by more than 200%. Faculty and students have been terrorized. The hatred and venom of these students and ex-students of the New Left have been especially centered on "so-called" liberal schools which display tolerance to this violence such as Berkeley, Harvard, Yale, Cornell and Columbia. The National Convention of the Democratic Party was the victim of violent and repeated terrorist activities. The last Presidential Inaugural Parade was the scene for violent leftist student attacks. Great sections of the campuses and the streets throughout our country have been reduced to shambles. Molotov cocktails have become standard equipment for the New Left students who are distributing *how-to-make-bombs* kits to high schools and university students. Scores of buildings have been burned and bombed. Banks have been burned. Bomb factories have been built by these dissident youth. Courts have been mobbed and terrorized. Policemen have been maimed and murdered.

What has been done to stop and punish this anarchy? Practically nothing!

This massive permissiveness on the part of officials of schools and government has placed a halo of tolerance and sanctity over the acts of violence committed by these college youth.

It all resembles, as stated by Shakespeare:

"A tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

Sadly, however, this sound and fury does signify something. It signifies to us that if our schools, government, and society, continue this permissiveness toward student violence, anarchy will reign, and our schools, society, and government will be destroyed.

Who are these student anarchists? What are their goals? All America knows the answer to each question. The activists do not attempt to hide their identity. They proudly tell the world who they are and that their objective is to destroy America. Hitler also explained his goals for world conquest with equal clarity. When he published his book, *Mein Kampf*, that small segment of the free world that took time to read it laughed. However, the free world ceased laughing at Hitler during 1939-1945.

The violent New Left of today cannot be classified under any one political philosophy. If anarchy can be classified as a political philosophy, that would probably be the best term. Although at times the New Left glorifies Communism and vilifies Nazism and Fascism, their actions fit these latter categories as well as they do Communism.

Theodore Gold, (who on March 7, 1970, was destroyed when his bomb factory blew up in Greenwich Village), on expressing his goal of having Africans and Asians rule America, stated that if necessary they would resort to Fascism to accomplish their desired results.

TOLERANCE OF VIOLENCE A WEAKNESS

This permissiveness, this tolerance of violence by faculty, administration, or government officials only encourages these youthful anarchists to greater destruction and arrogance. The milktoast philosophy of the officials in excusing crime because it is committed by a student merely adds fuel to the mounting blaze ignited by a vicious minority.

The warning made many centuries ago by the great Roman poet, Catullus, is eternally true: "Tolerance is the weakness of the strong."

Tolerance of the right of others is a virtue, but tolerance of mugging, of vile depravity, of looting, of kidnapping professors, of arson,

of stealing, of destruction, of throwing rocks at policemen, of desecrating the flag, of aiding our enemies, ceases to be a virtue and becomes oppression and tyranny.

To the enemies of our Country any tolerance of their illegal acts is not only considered a weakness; it is considered a surrender. Any show of weakness by the university administrators, any yielding to non-negotiable demands, only encourages the youthful anarchists to escalate their demands and the tempo and extent of their anarchy, and encourages others to join the pack.

The New Left terrorists reserve their greatest violence, their most unreasonable demands, and their greatest destruction to those schools who yield to them. Schools such as the University of California at Berkeley, San Francisco State College (before Hayakawa), Cornell, Columbia, Harvard, and Yale.

The disrespect to those schools which show the greatest tolerance for their illegal acts should not be a surprise to educators or anyone who is acquainted with youth. Youth has never respected those in authority, whether parent, teacher, or society, who do not command respect and lay out certain guidelines of behavior.

We hear on every hand that youth is attempting to tell us something. That is true. Youth is attempting to tell us the same message they have made plain through the ages: youth will never respect parents, teachers, or a society that has not demanded respect and discipline and guidance from them. Our present-day tolerance of their violence is the cause of continued violence.

The meek submission of the lawful majority to the insults and foul-mouthed threats of the "filthy punks" of the minority only encourages development of a future Hitler.

STILL OUT OF JAIL—STILL PROMOTING ANARCHY

Have these anarchists stopped their actions against society and their country since they were let out on bond awaiting the results of their appeals from conviction? Certainly not!

Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin addressed a gathering at Columbia University just after their release. Thirty seconds of silence was observed at this meeting to "honor two martyrs to the cause, accidentally killed two weeks ago, who will be hard to replace." This referred to the death of two of Rap Brown's friends, "Che" Payne, 26, and Ralph Featherstone, 30, who died when a large bomb in their car exploded near Bel Air, Maryland, on the night of March 9 just before Brown was to go on trial. (Rap Brown, 26, "jumped bond" and as of this writing is a fugitive and on the FBI list of the 10 most wanted men.)

At this meeting at Columbia University, Rubin and his cohorts demanded that the University furnish \$1,300,000 to pay bond for the release of Black Panthers who are facing trial for murdering one of their own members. This meeting at Columbia broke up in a wild melee of violence during which bricks were thrown through university windows and amounted to several thousand dollars worth of damage.

Newsweek contained a copyrighted story that the bombs being made in the Greenwich Village bomb factory that blew up in early March were being produced to blow up Columbia University in order to blackmail the University into giving this \$1,300,000 bond money.

Has any one been punished for this damage and this violent attempt to cripple Columbia University again? The answer is no.

To gain a better understanding of this growing anarchy, it might be well to look at one of many meetings being held by these convicted ex-student advocates of violence. On April 16, 1970, The Saratogian of Saratoga Springs, New York, reported a meeting addressed by Abbie Hoffman at Skidmore College. Hoffman was quoted as follows:

"Burning down a bank does more to fight pollution in this country than any goddam teach-in next week will ever do . . . The only courts we have left in this country are the streets . . . The hippies have to get guns and defend their communes . . ."

Hoffman also announced that there would be a mass demonstration in Washington on July 4 called a "smoke-in" to dramatize support for marijuana.

Rennie Davis, also one of those convicted in the Chicago trial, later spoke at Columbia stating that:

"The sixties was a time of sit-in—the seventies will be a time to burn the banks."

Students at Santa Barbara did burn a branch of the Bank of America and later attempted to burn the same bank in a temporary building. Many police were injured by the student mob, and a student attempting to protect the bank was killed. Davis also spoke at Purdue University where he displayed a Viet Cong flag. Hoffman spoke at Yale to promote the violence there. Every day they promote more and more anarchy. Although convicted, they are still out of jail.

During demonstrations at Kent State University which later resulted in the death of four students on May 4, Jerry Rubin addressed about 1,000 students on the University's front lawn. He cried:

"We have to disrupt every institution, break every law, we've got to all become criminals . . . Kill your parents."

Rubin called for a revolution to overthrow the government and change the system:

"Work is a dirty word. I don't work."

A few days later at the University of Alabama, Rubin told the students:

"Tear down the school systems. We're going to destroy private property. Nobody will own a factory and have other people work for him."

Few have shown the diligence of Jerry Rubin in his concerted efforts to show his contempt for and to destroy the United States. He has written a new book, *Do It!* (published by Simon and Schuster, 1970.) This book contains 256 pages of lewd, vicious, vile four-letter words. Sprinkled with pornographic pictures and seething with hate for our country and society, it would be shocking even to an off-color men's smoker.

Just a few statements from this book will follow. In commenting about the attack on the Pentagon in October, 1967, by the New Left:

"Victory! Flags of the Viet Cong, that beautiful yellow star on a red and blue field, waved high in front of the Pentagon."

"Bonnie Parker and Clyde Barrow are the leaders of the new youth."

"To steal from the rich is a sacred and religious act."

"Kids should steal money from their parents."

"Walk on red lights."

"Don't walk on green lights."

"Sirhan Sirhan is a yippie."

Rubin, the founder of the Yippie Party, indicated pride in Sirhan Sirhan, who assassinated Senator Robert Kennedy, as did the Weathermen "Council of War" at Flint, Michigan, in December 1969.

In this same book, Rubin described the violence that he and others committed at the Democratic Convention in Chicago in 1968 and made "recommendations":

"Yippies set fires in garbage cans, knocked them into the streets, set off fire alarms, disrupted traffic, broke windows with rocks, created chaos in a hundred different directions . . . police cars caught alone were ripped apart with rocks."

"Burn down the schools."

"Two hundred psychological terrorists could destroy any major university—without firing a shot."

"Drop out! Why stay in school? To get a

degree? Print your own! Can you smoke a diploma?

"Universities are feudal autocracies. Professors are house niggers and students are field niggers. Demonstrations on campuses aren't 'demonstrations'—they're jail breaks. Slave revolts.

"We're using the campus as a launching pad to foment revolution everywhere.

"The Youth International Revolution will begin with mass breakdown of authority, mass rebellion, total anarchy in every institution in the Western world. Tribes of longhairs, blacks, armed women, workers, peasants and students will take over.

Jerry Rubin's wife Nancy stopped in Moscow on her way to Hanoi and stated:

"We have been invited by the North Vietnamese Government. We are a new nation, not the nation of President Nixon. We hope to establish our own diplomatic relations and gain recognition."

And where is Rubin today? What is he doing. He and his convicted cohorts are speaking at educational institutions throughout the country, demanding the overthrow and the destruction of schools, society, and country. In many instances he is being paid for making these speeches by the educational institutions, paid by taxpayers' money.

Rubin today is free on bond and free to continue to prey on other campuses and in the streets to incite others to violence.

A STAR OF HOPE

Through the smoke of bombs and arson, over the vituperations of hate and bitterness engendered by the riots on the campuses and in the streets, there is seen a faint star of hope. There is being heard the voice of the old-time American strength, intelligence, and courage.

Parents, students and concerned faculty are attempting to break the dominance of campus trouble-makers and irresponsible faculty members and to keep the universities open.

The responsible Black leadership is becoming increasingly aware that many of their people are being used as tools by violent activists.

Those honestly concerned with the betterment of education are being brought to realize that the continuance of violence and the irresponsibility on the part of students and faculty is "drying up" the money needed for higher education. The donors to our educational institutions are becoming increasingly reluctant to contribute until sanity returns to the campuses.

Legislators are becoming increasingly reluctant to tax their constituents to provide money to be used for irresponsible violence. Needed grants and funds for higher education are being curtailed.

In Joseph Alsop's column, "The High Cost of Chomsky," which appeared in the June 5, 1970, issue of the *Pacific Stars and Stripes*, stated the following:

"Just about a year ago Professor Chomsky and his New Left allies among the students and faculty began a violent assault upon all defense-linked research at MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)."

According to Alsop:

"With a lot of help from friends and followers, Professor Noam Chomsky now appears to have cost the Massachusetts Institute of Technology around \$5 million a year. It seems a high price to pay for a linguistic theorist, however brilliant."

The great working people of America, both young and old, are demonstrating a growing phalanx of strength for order against violence, for Americanism as against alien "isms," for education as against "campus hooliganism."

Courts and juries, both State and Federal, are demonstrating an increasing willingness to convict and sentence youthful law violators even though they are students.

Deans and other University administrators are beginning to accept their responsibilities in the suspension and expulsion of the more notorious, illegal and violent student activists. They still carry out these responsibilities slowly and with great reluctance, but progress is being made.

At the graduation exercises at Cornell on June 8 a 77-year-old Professor, Morris Bishop, courageously swung the "Mace" (a symbol of authority) striking a young demonstrator who was interfering with the commencement. This was certainly a great advance since some previously disruptive action at this same school.

There is some slow, quite slow progress being made in ridding the universities of the incompetent and unsavory faculty members.

Even though the word "liberal" has been greatly misused in recent years, it is still proper to say that the great liberals (not the synthetic phonies) and educators, who through the ages have fought for freedom of mind, freedom of speech, and freedom of action, and who are dedicated pioneers of real education are today taking the lead on the campus and in the press in demanding the end of campus violence in the name of dissent. It is becoming evident that no one has a greater contempt for the violent leftists than do the sincere liberals and dedicated professors.

Let's name a few of these great liberals—Sidney Hook, Lewis S. Feuer, John P. Roche, Max Lerner. Many of us at times believed that they had gone too far in their liberal philosophy, but today they are courageously demonstrating their dedication to the principles they stand for.

These sincere liberals are aware, as are all capable and dedicated educators, that we have serious problems today, serious problems pertaining to our environment, violence, race relations, housing, education, national security, health, our economy and international good will. The solutions to these problems are dependent on improving education—education in its broadest truest, and greatest sense.

Many great Americans are today in the vanguard fighting against the phonies of the New Left and fighting to return sanity and real education to the campus. They are aware that violence begets violence and that unless sanity returns to the campus our great freedoms and opportunities through education will disappear. Perhaps no failure can so damage America as allowing violence to downgrade and destroy our educational institutions. The crisis we are facing today was vividly expressed in the column written by John P. Roche, former President of the ADA:

"A minority of students and a minority of faculty are wallowing in anti-intellectualism—and in the process intimidating the rest of the academic community... The tragic implications should be emphasized: Those in America who desperately want an education—not a worthless certificate from a progressive kindergarten—are being deprived of their rights as institution after institution goes into intellectual bankruptcy."

The Washington Post, whose credentials of liberalism cannot be challenged, in an editorial of May 19, 1970, entitled "Education on Ice," criticized the closing of 381 colleges and universities:

"As though education were a sort of pabulum which would be set aside in a freezer until students regained an appetite for it."

In this same newspaper, on May 20, 1970, there appeared the following statement in the Evans and Novak column entitled, "Only State Government can Save Liberal Education at Berkeley":

"With the students insurgent, the faculty largely permissive, and the administration relatively unconcerned about academic free-

dom, only the state government is left to preserve liberal education at state universities such as this one."

Walter Reuther, in one of his last public statements to the United Auto Workers at Atlantic City, said:

"The ultra-left extremists with their revolutionary slogans and their reckless behavior can sow the seeds of a unique form of American fascism. These young people who, in their revolutionary zeal, are afflicted with what Lenin called 'infantile leftism' do not understand the essential dynamics of social change... They think what they need is to bring down in total ruins and then out of the ashes of the old they will build the new... When you are in favor of destroying the system, the worst enemy is anyone who is trying to make it responsive to human needs."

Sidney Hook who for decades has been outstanding as a liberal philosopher, liberal teacher, and liberal writer—wrote in his "The Perverse Ideology of Violence":

"Some faculty apologists for the student rebels have sought to play down the enormity of the offenses against intellectual and academic freedom by dismissing them as inconsequential. 'Just a few buildings burned,' they say. This is as if one were to extenuate the corruption of justice by the numbers of magistrates not bribed, or lynchings by their infrequency. Sober fact is that violence has reached such proportions on the campuses today that the whole atmosphere of American—and many European and Japanese—universities has been transformed. The appeal to reason is no longer sufficient to resolve problems or even to keep the peace. In order to make itself heard in some of our most prestigious institutions, the appeal to reason must appeal to the police."

Hook, later speaking on May 19, 1970, before 2,500 educators in New York, expressed a great worry about the weakness displayed among university administrators: "Moral courage is in a very short supply."

A cry to return to reason is sounded by Steven Kelman of the 1970 class at Harvard, in *Push Comes to Shove*, published by Houghton Mifflin in 1970. He clearly describes the rapid disintegration of Harvard. This clear and lucid narrative of what has been going on at Harvard for the last few years should be read by every educator:

"Joseph Goebbels used to say that if you repeat a lie often enough, it becomes the truth. This is especially true for those, like students, who can't test lies and truth against the daily confrontation with the hard and real world... Destroying the university was seen as the way to save it. Irrationality was praised as a higher form of rationalism. A Harvard scientist's development of an improved strain of rice was viewed as complicity with American imperialism."

"The paradox was that the effect of this burst of active idealism was so different from that which most who undertook it had in mind. They loved Harvard, yet they shook it and almost destroyed it. They respected scholarship, yet they replaced it with slogans. The nightmare is that it can be the most idealistic who introduce the most terrible systems of degradation and unfreedom we can imagine."

"Does sanity have a future at Harvard?" Kelman asks and in the last sentence of his book says:

"If we do not labor with all we have within us to give sanity a future at Harvard, then the answer to the question will surely be no."

There are other signs of hope. President Nathan Pusey of Harvard University, wrote James Reston of the New York TIMES, "who has been a modest and hesitant public figure in the past... condemned the Harvard faculty members who sided with the leftists in last year's attack on the university administration."

And, most hopeful of all, Steven Kelman

who was mentioned earlier as the author of **PUSH COMES TO SHOVE**, was permitted to address his own graduation exercises at Harvard. He said:

"Our biggest mistake has been to let the so called 'new' left emerge as our spokesman . . . can we wonder why the American people will continue to be hostile toward students as long as we allow the rock-throwers, the burners, the totalitarians to represent us? Do we have a right to expect anything else?"

"There is only one way we can gain the respect and overcome the hostility of the American people. And that is by addressing ourselves to the unromantic and unexciting problems which just happen to be the problems which affect the ordinary American in his day-to-day life . . . for in the final analysis it can only be the American people, not a student elite pledged to one-part dictatorship, that can bring about change."

May that "Star of Hope" that we see through the smoke of violence and hate be in reality the dawning of the "light of reason" displacing the fog and clouds of growing hate and anarchy.

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT TO
NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS—
JULY 6, 1970

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

CAMBODIA

(NOTE.—Congressman Lee H. Hamilton has just returned from a fact-finding mission in Southeast Asia. He was one of 12 selected by the Speaker of the House to make a report to Congress on the U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia. This report, which will deal with U.S. policy, will be covered in future releases.

(The following is an account of a visit with American units in Cambodia, prior to the U.S. pull-out on June 30. With Congressman Hamilton on the Cambodian inspection tour was Congressman C. V. Montgomery (D-Miss.) and Howard W. Robison (R-N.Y.).)

The helicopter which carried us into Cambodian territory flew at about 5,000 feet, well above its normal flying altitude, to keep out of the range of small arms fire from the enemy. Lower, and at each side of the craft, gunship helicopters cruised with us, watching for signs of the enemy.

When we reached an American base camp in the Cambodian jungle, the helicopter made a swift, vertical descent into the clearing of some 400 yards in diameter. While the gunships circled overhead, we landed just outside two barbed-wire defense rings and we were escorted into the camp area, which was ringed with sandbag and earthen defense works.

The fortified clearing was the center of operations for several American companies, and most of the men had spent the last month or more in the jungle, serving on patrols and enduring mortar attacks on the base.

Among those with whom I talked at the base camp was Lt. Ray B. Hersman, son of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest R. Hersman, New Albany. All with whom I talked appeared tired, but proud of the work they had done. They had been carrying the brunt of the Cambodian operations, searching out hidden stores of enemy supplies and equipment and making almost daily contact with the enemy during the patrols.

Found in their search was food, ammunition, bicycle and bicycle parts, medical equip-

ment, and weapons. Bicycles, I was told, were the primary carriers of supplies in the jungle area, laden with as much as 600 pounds of supplies, and wheeled along jungle trails by the enemy. An American medical officer told me the medical supplies which had been unearthed were as sophisticated as his own.

After lunch with the men—beef stew, mashed potatoes, peas and grape drink—we departed for a clearing in the jungle some 20 to 30 miles to visit the site of recently discovered caches of ammunition. There, we visited an American company which had been exposed to consistent enemy attacks in recent weeks. Nearly half the men had been killed or wounded.

I noticed immediately the tension and fatigue in their faces. Most were shirtless in the 100-degree, airless jungle heat. Most were bearded and grimy since baths were not available in this forward area. The commander, a Negro captain of about 25, said the unit had been under nightly attacks and had been skirmishing with the enemy almost daily on patrols. Despite the fatigue and the tension, however, they were genuinely pleased to see somebody from the "outside."

The Captain escorted us to the site of a cache which had been found just a few hours earlier. This one consisted of three bunkers, each about 15 by 15 feet, which were filled with ammunition. They had been found by an alert soldier, who, after sensing how spongy the ground was underfoot, probed down about two feet and found one of the storage areas. As we inspected the caches, they were being charged with explosives, to be detonated before the American pull-out.

We left the area, where the temperatures are stifling, where the enemy can conceal himself within a few feet, where any movement in the foliage is cause for alarm, with a deep sense of appreciation for what these young men are called upon to do. Most of those with whom I talked were 19 to 22 years of age.

EXPERT IN OCEANOGRAPHIC
MATTERS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, recently a very gifted and wonderful friend passed away. Wilbert Chapman was an expert in oceanographic matters and he aided us on many occasions to preserve and protect the fishing industry of this Nation. Not only did he teach a great deal about the ocean and its inhabitants; he taught hundreds of others in colleges, Government and industry, in nearly every country of the world. He was a man of boundless energy and he leaves a legacy of fine writings; phenomenal in quality, scope, and distribution.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to insert the following eulogy into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was written by one of Wib's very close friends, Mr. Harold F. Cary of San Diego, Calif. I think it succeeds beautifully in capturing the essence of Wib's greatness:

WILBERT McLEOD CHAPMAN

About six years ago some of us were asked to designate successors to the key men in a company where Wib Chapman and I were employed. After his name, for his replacement, I wrote—"No one"—It was true then; it is true now.

He would regard such a statement, in such a context, as sentimental. He did not consider himself a sentimental man. Yet, in the deepest sense of the term, he was. The depth and power of his devotion to important causes made him so. He was a passionate man in his devotion to the truth. He had a towering contempt for untruth.

In his work he was exactly what he wanted to be—a teacher. He was invariably described as a leader of science and fisheries movements in government, industry and education, and he was all these things; but it was as a thinker, expositor and teacher that he made his greatest mark. He did not want followers—he wanted to develop and encourage equals or superiors. He avidly sought information from everyone to improve his work, broaden his knowledge, and refine his point of view.

His pupils were legion. They were found not only on college campuses, as in his earlier years but, increasingly, over the years, throughout science, government and industry, and in nearly every country of our world. They included all of us.

One simple story illustrates how he was regarded. On leaving India on one occasion, we had to be at the airport at 4:00 A.M. Despite the hour and difficulty of travel, there waiting was a young Indian student-scientist, his wife and 3 small children, dressed in their best. He told me he simply wanted his young family to see and to remember his friend and teacher, Dr. Chapman.

His courage, drive and energy were enormous. His was the greatest voice American fisheries have ever had—and what a voice it was! In a way he was larger than life. His writings were phenomenal in quality, scope and distribution. Nothing like them has been seen in science, government and industry—certainly in our field of activity, before—nor is it likely to be seen again. We have all read and profited from them and have built on them. Many of us have felt wounded by something we did not agree with. But a great teacher does not provide copy book exercises—he challenges the thinking process—that made Wib Chapman a great teacher and a leader of thought in his field. It resulted in transfer of thought into action. If he thought there was not enough action, he took it himself—

What does a man leave behind? Was the prodigious effort of this man only valuable in its time and, otherwise, was it like writing on water?

The clear, absolute reality is that he made and left an impact on so many people in so many places. The tangibility and lasting qualities of it can be attested to by each of us in his own way, and so by all of us in many ways. He shaped thinking that will still be carried on to accomplishment by others.

He leaves a strong, fine and talented family, who have contributed and will contribute much to the quality of life around them.

In many ways he was a great man.

In every way he was our good, and altogether wonderful, friend.

SOUTH CAROLINA AMERICAN LEGION
ENDORSES CAMBODIAN
CAMPAIGN

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, at their department convention on June 27 the South Carolina American Legion adopted a splendid resolution supporting the President in his actions in Cambodia. I commend this resolution adopted by an

outstanding loyal and patriotic organization of my home State to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and the citizens of our country:

THE AMERICAN LEGION DEPARTMENT OF
SOUTH CAROLINA

A RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF SOUTH CAROLINA AT THEIR DEPARTMENT CONVENTION ON JUNE 27, 1970:

Whereas the President of the United States of America has been severely criticized for his action in ordering troops into Cambodia; and

Whereas the purpose for ordering such troops into Cambodia was to prevent further loss of American lives; now therefore be it

Resolved, by The American Legion, Department of South Carolina in regular Convention assembled in Charleston, S.C. this 27th day of June 1970 does wholeheartedly endorse and support the action of the President of the United States and its Military Commanders in sending American Forces into Cambodia to destroy enemy sanctuaries and supplies which threatened the safety of American Forces in Viet Nam; and be it further

Resolved, that copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Members of the South Carolina delegation to the Congress of the United States and to the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Certified to be a true copy of a resolution adopted at the S.C. Department Convention on June 27, 1970.

PAGE N. KESSEE,
Department Adjutant.

THE GUN CONTROL ACT—HOW
MUCH LONGER?

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, The American Rifleman for July 1970 carries a highly interesting editorial entitled "The Gun Control Act—How Much Longer?" It portrays clearly the steps that are underway by Federal bureaucracy to make the 1968 Federal Gun Control Act more restrictive than Congress intended and to further hamper the rights of law-abiding citizens to own weapons. My own mail shows many cases of overzealous actions by law enforcement officials and, in some instances, extreme measures to restrict the legitimate activities of dealers and weapons owners. The editorial should be carefully read by every Member of Congress. It is time to take a second look at the Gun Control Act. It is time to set the stage for repeal:

THE GUN CONTROL ACT—HOW MUCH LONGER?

For more than a year and a half now, millions of U.S. gun owners have tried conscientiously to live with and under the 1968 Federal Gun Control Act. They have signed forms to purchase guns, to buy ammunition, and for much else. Their compliance has been a marvel of patience and exemplary citizenship.

During that time, these good citizens have seen things go from bad to worse in ways apparently never contemplated by the sponsors of the Act.

They have seen crime, under this supposed anti-crime law, spread rather than decrease.

They have seen foes of firearms openly avow

for the first time they intend to disarm all citizens and eventually all police.

They have seen anti-handgun bills piled on top of registration and licensing bills in a relentless anti-gun campaign.

They have seen Federal investigators knock at the doors of law-abiding gun buyers, "Just checking up."

And they have seen Federal bureaucrats, holdovers from past administrations, campaign for more gun laws in what sometimes resembles an all-out attack on gun ownership.

So most have come to recognize the main issue and to realize that there can be no compromising on it.

The main issue is whether individual Americans may own firearms for sport and protection, or whether private ownership shall be gradually gnawed away by more new anti-gun laws and regulations.

Evidence of a show-down battle on gun control have been growing.

The Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Division of Internal Revenue Services, the agency responsible for administering the Act, recently admitted (American Rifleman, June, 1970, p. 59) that a sampling of gun buyers selected at random from dealer records are "subjected to a criminal record check through local or State criminal identification bureaus . . . to identify criminals who have unlawfully purchased such firearms." It does not say how many innocent Americans are subjected to unnecessary criminal investigation in the process—simply because, in buying a gun, they complied with the law.

The ATF insists that it does not really suspect wrongdoing on the part of those investigated individuals but must make the checks under its obligation to enforce the Act. The Act, by the way, does not specifically require or authorize this.

The curious performance is suspecting the best and searching for the worst came to light by chance through an NRA Member in a small town in Pennsylvania. Small towns being what they are, word quickly got back to this citizen that he and his wife were being investigated by police. What had they done? They had bought two shotguns in a nearby town to go hunting, and had signed the dealer register as required by the Act.

Learning that ATF agents had made four copies of the purchase record and had sent two to the parttime local policeman and to State police, Robert C. DeReamus, 433 Main St., Tatamy, Pa., wrote to the White House Feb. 20, 1970, asking:

"1. What are my rights as a citizen when the IRS, Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Division agent knocks on my door to check out my firearms purchase?

"2. What was done with the four (4) copies of my firearms transaction made by the ATF agents? Who has them and why?

"3. What assurance do I have as a law-abiding citizen that those records will not be used to steal (unofficially) or confiscate (officially) my firearms?"

On April 1, 1970, K. Martin Worthy, Chief Counsel for the IRS, replied on behalf of the White House—but, DeReamus says, did not answer his three questions.

" . . . At times, a person who is listed as the purchaser of a firearm might be contacted in order to verify the dealer's records," Worthy wrote, "I can assure you, however, that the purpose of such interview is not to determine whether or not the purchaser is a 'dope addict' or a 'mental case'; it is simply to ensure that the name of the real purchaser is recorded by the dealer."

A different response, however, was made to U.S. Sen. Richard S. Schweiker, of Pennsylvania, who had interested himself in the DeReamus case, by Harold A. Serr, ATF Director. Serr wrote that the purpose was "to detect violators where firearms purchasers furnish false information or give fictitious names," and said "this procedure has identi-

fied 962 persons with criminal records" in seven months.

DeReamus offered his own comment on it all. "I cannot shake the feeling," he said, "that the IRS considered everyone dealing with or owning guns as a suspect."

Any such feelings of gun owners have been heightened by several actions of ATF officials.

The ATF produced last year at taxpayers' expense a so-called enforcement movie in which viewers found "bloodcurdling" violence and anti-gun propaganda. This controversial film was withdrawn at the insistence of Congressman John Dingell (16th Dist., Mich.), and others. Whereupon Sen. Thomas J. Dodd (Conn.) and other anti-gun spokesmen in Congress screamed to high heaven—thus confirming that the anti-gun people wanted the film.

Then at a national conference of liquor law administrators this spring, an ATF official devoted one-fifth of his speech to liquor laws and four-fifths to argument for more gun controls. His position included the following:

Individuals have no constitutional right to firearms whatsoever.

The United States is the only country in the world to allow almost unlimited and unrestricted sale of firearms.

Handguns are rarely for sporting purposes and are basically "anti-person" weapons.

The criticism of handguns, of course, dovetails neatly with the falsehood popularized by the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence and Rep. Abner Mikva of Chicago, author of two handgun control bills, that handguns are made "only to kill."

The ATF has doubled the number of its field investigators, from 290 to approximately 600, since the Act took effect. It has investigated the huge guns on a deactivated battleship, informed an antiques dealer that he needed an "implements of war" license to import flints for flintlock guns, and performed other prodigies of enforcement under Act ostensibly intended to curb crime. (How often are battleships used in crime?)

On the other hand, it also informed some of its investigators in an official publication in May that "ATF does not file Federal charges against every felon to whom they trace a gun. Many criminals are small-time and can be successfully discouraged from carrying guns by small fines or a few days in jail."

Quite clearly, the 1968 Gun Control Act has become the basis for arbitrary bureaucratic activity and a degree of "regulation" never specified by the Act. It has also become the basis for more proposed anti-gun legislation.

As long as the Act exists, it is like a noose that can be tightened around the throat of legitimate gun ownership at any time to strangle off private ownership of firearms in America.

If Americans wish to keep their guns, it appears that they will have to get rid of the 1968 Gun Control Act.

THE ECONOMY

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the economy of this Nation is a source of continual concern to everyone. Some of us are conversant with the various economic doctrines, theoretical, and econometric models, that are being used to analyze our current situation. Yet for all this technical discourse, tangible manifestations of our economic condition are dis-

played: Housewives legitimately complain of increased food prices; citizens on fixed incomes are often unable to afford basic necessities; growing unemployment and underemployment is increasing; and wages are seldom adjusted to cover increased prices.

In the face of these conditions, the Nixon administration has not taken timely or effective economic actions. Early last year Treasury officials hinted that if conditions did not improve, controls might be considered. Many urged the adoption of selected controls at that time. This advice went unheeded. The Nixon administration put full faith in monetary controls and the result has been continued inflation, lower production, and increased unemployment. Our housing industry is immobilized; the stock market has plummeted; and one of our major corporations is in deep financial trouble. The administration has belatedly and reluctantly adopted a modest version of voluntary wage price control which will have little economic effect. These voluntary wage price controls seem designed more for public relations than economic impact.

All of these actions bespeak a considerable amount of administration uncertainty. For example, the administration unveiled its new budget, claiming a \$1.3 billion surplus which was created by drawing from various trust funds. Now we are told that there will be a deficit of \$1.8 billion. While I do not feel that a deficit or a surplus of a few billion dollars will affect the economy substantially, mere juggling of figures reflects a lack of understanding of the dynamics of the economy on the part of the administration. The uncertainty in the economic area has not been aided by the "victory around the corner" speeches that have been offered by the administration.

The lack of postwar economic planning suggests that the administration will be caught reacting to economic circumstances in the future as in the past. Mr. Speaker, Herbert Rowan's recent article, "Nixon Economists Under Fire," analyzes some of the aspects of our current economic situation. I recommend the reading of this article to my colleagues and insert this article in the RECORD at this point:

NIXON ECONOMISTS COME UNDER FIRE
(By Hobart Rowen)

These are tough days for Nixon administration economists. Their hopeful predictions a year ago that we now would have inflation under control haven't panned out, and even their rhetoric has been assailed by friendly critics such as Prof. Milton Friedman and Democratic sharpshooters like Walter Heller.

Friedman said on "Meet the Press" last Sunday that "... too many statements (have) given the public the impression that the administration has been following a waver policy. It hasn't ... I think it is wise to make few promises until the results are in."

But Dr. Friedman to the contrary notwithstanding, the administration has been wavering, and for a simple reason: it has lost confidence in its own assumption that the economy would turn up by the end of the year.

"The things which should be going up—home building, take-home pay, and real economic growth—are coming down," says Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield. "At the

same time, the things that should be coming down—such as interest rates, the cost of living, and unemployment are going up."

Allow for Mansfield's milking the situation of political benefit, and it's still not a bad summary of the current economic situation.

Real Gross National Product (which is the sum of all the goods and services) declined at an annual rate of 3 per cent in the first quarter of the year, and—although White House spokesmen two months ago were talking of an upturn in the second quarter—Treasury Secretary David Kennedy has questioned whether this will happen.

"Recession," as a word, is banned from the Nixon dictionary; but if the second quarter GNP slips further, as Secretary Kennedy now hints, it will be clear that we have been in a mild recession since about last September or October.

The question then becomes: will it be a serious recession? There is no doubt that officials here are jittery, not only because of the real slump in the economy. The feeling is accentuated by the spectacular slide in the stock market and the bankruptcy of the Penn Central railroad.

So far, the recession hasn't cut very deep. Unemployment is at 5 per cent and industrial production has dropped only 2.5 per cent from the peak last July. By contrast, unemployment rose to over 7 per cent in the 1957-58 recession, and the drop in industrial output was 12.5 per cent.

But there are two factors which raise at least a question about the strength of the economy over the next several months:

The long-sustained capital goods boom has run out of steam. High interest rates, a shortage of cash and credit, and the softer economy itself finally appear to be depressing corporate intentions to add to or modernize industrial capacity. This was to have been a cushion against a deep economic slide.

The winding down of defense spending is contributing to a squeeze on corporate profits and adding to the jobless totals. President Nixon reported in his speech on the economy that a reduction of less than \$2 billion in defense spending within a year has been translated into a loss of 300,000 defense jobs. And for next year, the defense budget calls for further reductions of \$5 billion.

Federal Reserve Gov. Andrew F. Brimmer makes the interesting observation that by the final quarter of this year, defense spending will have dropped from a peak of 9.2 percent of GNP in the second quarter of 1967 to only 7.5 percent, which will be back to the same level that prevailed when President Johnson escalated the Vietnam war in the summer of 1965.

Despite the now-substantial evidence that the defense sector is a "waning influence on the economy," postwar economic planning doesn't appear to have advanced very far at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

On the more cheerful side of the ledger is the prospect that consumer pocketbooks generally will be fatter: as of today, the remaining surtax (5 percent) will have expired, adding some \$2 billion to the spending potential in the last six months of 1970.

In addition, recent increases in Social Security benefits and in government pay levels will pump more than \$7 billion at annual rates, into the economy.

But the big question is: will consumers spend their extra money? There are bitter lessons from the past that an increase in consumer incomes is not always immediately translated into purchases at the stores. Because of the long-sustained inflation, and worries about financial markets, consumers may well decide to save, rather than spend, an unusually large chunk of their increased income.

For all of these reasons, the administration is not so sure about the future. It shows increasing concern (although it is not likely

to say so directly) that the current downturn will gather too much momentum. There is a discussion going on right now within the administration on how far a new expansionist policy should be pushed.

The worry, or the wavering, cautiously surfaced in President Nixon's own speech on the economy: "... we're heading for the dock of price stability: We have to ease up on the power of our restraint and let our momentum carry us safely into port."

"That's why our independent central banking system has seen fit to ease up on the money supply. That is why I relaxed the cutback on federally-assisted construction projects and why I have not asked for a new surtax." The President did not say so, but he also knew that Congress would not extend the surtax, even if he had asked for it.

If the picture being painted is grimmer than last year's, at least it is more realistic. The administration may stop, as Heller urged, "optimistically, euphemistically, and just plain mystically assuring us that everything is nicely under control ..."

**EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR THE
ANTISECRECY AMENDMENTS**

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this week the House is considering H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. While I applaud the efforts of the Rules Committee and its special subcommittee in reporting out this measure, I feel that it can be improved, particularly in the area of removing the cloak of secrecy from the proceedings of the House. Three recent editorials, from the Fond du Lac, Wis., Commonwealth Reporter, the Paper of Oshkosh, Wis., and Monday's Washington Star, detail why the House should approve the antisecrecy amendments. I insert these editorials for the information of the House:

[From the Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter, July 10, 1970]

IMPORTANT ANTI-SECRECY AMENDMENTS

A group of 22 "Members of Congress, Republican and Democratic, liberal and conservative," are sponsoring a series of important anti-secrecy amendments to H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, which is scheduled for House action the week of July 13.

"These amendments include recording how members vote on major issues both in committee and on the House floor, opening committee hearings and meetings to the press and the public, and requiring the availability of committee reports and hearings before final House action on legislation," the congressman said in a letter to a number of editors.

"These are important reforms," they added. "But their acceptance will depend, at least in part, on the amount of public visibility they receive and the extent to which the public—and the press—demands them."

"Unfortunately, in this regard, there is a tendency in many quarters to look upon reform of House rules and procedures as an internal 'housekeeping' matter of little concern to the public. We are sure you will agree that nothing could be further from the truth; that how the House conducts its affairs can have a significant impact on the lives of the American people and the well-being of the nation."

Standing behind the amendments are Republicans Edward B. Blester Jr. (R-Pa.), James C. Cleveland (R-N.H.), Barber B. Conable Jr. (R-N.Y.), John Dellenback (R-Ore.), John N. Erlenborn (R-Ill.), Charles S. Gubser (R-Calif.), Paul N. McCloskey Jr. (R-Calif.), Thomas F. Rallsback (R-Ill.), Donald W. Riegle Jr. (R-Mich.), William A. Steiger (R-Wis.), and Robert Taft Jr. (R-Ohio).

Members of the Democratic Party supporting the amendments are Jonathan B. Bingham (D-N.Y.), John Brademas (D-Ind.), James C. Corman (D-Calif.), Donald M. Fraser (D-Minn.), Sam M. Gibbons (D-Fla.), Ken Hechler (D-W. Va.), Abner J. Mikva (D-Ill.), James G. O'Hara (D-Mich.), Thomas M. Rees (D-Calif.), Henry S. Reuss (D-Wis.), and Morris K. Udall (D-Ariz.).

We can think of nothing more important to the American public than a free flow of accurate information by which Members of Congress can be judged accordingly.

As it is today, the House rules and procedures allow a system which is confusing, unnecessarily secret and, therefore, in violation of the time-honored principle, "The public has a right to know what its government is doing."

We believe the amendments offered by the 22 bi-partisan Members of Congress, if accepted, will add teeth to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970.

The public should waste no time in urging their congressmen to support the series of anti-secrecy amendments. Write your representatives today and tell them you back an open government in a democratic society.

[From the Evening Star, July 13, 1970]

ON THE RECORD

One of the cherished traditions of the House of Representatives is the secrecy that cloaks many of that body's most important operations. Approximately half the committee hearings and meetings are closed to the press and the public. Committee votes are, for the most part, never made public. Committee reports are customarily kept from the view of everyone—including members of Congress—until hours before a floor vote. And votes on vital amendments are hidden from the prying eyes of newsmen and constituents by the parliamentary maneuver of the non-record vote.

Observers of Congress and handfulls of idealistic congressmen have long viewed this passion for secrecy as an odd manifestation of democracy in action. And now, as the Legislative Reorganization bill heads for the floor of Congress, there are strong indications that at least a part of the veil will be lifted.

The bill—the first congressional reorganization measure in 24 years—provides that most committee hearings will be open and that some will be televised. Some 50 planned amendments will, for the most part, attempt to open more of the operations of the House to public inspection. The secret vote has drawn the particular attention of the reformers.

The Democratic Study Group, a collection of some 100 House liberals, has launched an all-out attack on the practice of non-record voting. They have, somewhat surprisingly, picked up significant support from the conservative outposts of both parties.

There is no real question as to why the secret vote originated and why it has been continued to this day. The purpose is to keep the voters back home from knowing for certain how their man in Congress voted on a particular bill.

That is, to be sure, not the reason usually cited by the defenders of congressional secrecy. They argue that roll-call votes take too much time. Or they claim that keeping constituents in the dark permits a representative to vote according to the dictates of his conscience rather than the dictates of political expedience. Some defenders, in desperation, have been known to cite the historical precedent of the British Parliament and the Continental Congress.

Taking these one at a time:

The reform-pushers point out that the time-consuming roll call is not the only alternative to secrecy. A teller vote, which is one of the methods now favored by the secrecy lobby, could be employed. The only change required would be the recording—and the publication—of the individual votes, instead of the counting of numbers of ayes and nays and letting it go at that. Or, should the House decide to enter the 20th Century completely, electronic voting devices could be installed that would provide a record vote in a matter of seconds.

As for the contention that consciences are freer if the voters are kept in the dark, it is necessary only to note that a representative's first duty is to represent the collective conscience and the will of his district.

Finally, the historical argument falls apart with the realization that the secrecy of Parliament and the Continental Congress arose out of a wholesome respect for the wrath of the King of England.

Today, the Congress of the United States has scant cause to fear the wrath of the British monarch. As for the M.P.'s, they decided 138 years ago that there wasn't too much a threat from the throne, and they dropped the unrecorded teller vote from their rules of order.

It's time for the House to go fully on the record, too.

[From the Oshkosh (Wis.) the Paper, July 14, 1970]

HOUSE SHOULD END ITS SECRECY

A bipartisan group of Congressmen is leading a reform movement to do away with much of the secrecy in the House of Representatives.

The group includes two Wisconsin Congressmen, William A. Steiger, an Oshkosh Republican and Henry Reuss, a Milwaukee Democrat.

In a statement, the group said, "We believe secrecy undermines the democratic process and saps public confidence in the House as

a responsive and legislative body. We think the public has a right to know what is happening in Congress and how Members vote on major national issues. Indeed, the democratic process cannot function without the free flow of such information."

This reform is long overdue.

Due to archaic House Rules, many which have been in effect since the First Congress, recorded votes are not taken on many major issues. By meeting as a Committee of the Whole, for example, the House can and does avoid a recorded vote on issues that may be of vital concern to the voters back home.

Many issues are decided by voice or standing votes, counted by Representatives acting as tellers. No printed record is kept.

Votes were taken with no records kept, for example, on such issues as funds for American forces in Cambodia, Laos and Thailand, the supersonic transport, and the safeguard missile system.

Through the use of teller votes, Congressmen can avoid taking a public stand on controversial issues. They also can talk one way and vote another. There have been cases where votes are known to have changed when the matter happened to come up again on a roll call vote.

To change things, Steiger and the other reformers are proposing that the teller votes be recorded and made public. Certainly, the Members of the House should be willing to let the people back home know how they voted. After all, a Congressman's voting record should be the main criterion by which the voter judges his Congressman.

Steiger, who has been a leading advocate of House reform, is willing to stand on his record. He is to be complimented for this position. On the same note, other Congressmen also should be willing to be judged.

In its simplest form, it's known as being honest with the voters.

There also is another major part to the reform proposal. This would limit the common practice of secret committee and subcommittee meetings. About half of this business is done in secret by the House, including the powerful House Appropriations Committee which does all of its business behind closed doors.

This is in contrast to the Senate, which does most of its work in session open to the public.

Of main concern in these matters is the public's right to know what their Representatives are doing or not doing, as the case may be.

Another bad part about the House's secrecy is that it increases absenteeism. Not only don't people know how their Representative voted, they also don't know if he was present. Many times, where no record is kept, Representatives don't make it a point to be present for a vital vote.

These matters and others are scheduled for action this week. Let us hope that enough Congressmen follow the lead of Steiger, Reuss, and other reformers. Unfortunately, we will learn only the outcome. The vote on reform, also, will be taken secretly.

SENATE—Wednesday, July 15, 1970

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers and our God, who hast made and preserved us a nation, make us a people mindful of Thy favor, obedient to Thy laws and glad to do Thy will.

Create in us clean hearts and pure minds, that we may be, in this age,

heroes of the spirit, as our fathers were in days past.

Make us great enough and good enough and strong enough for the times in which we live.

As we undertake our tasks this day, may goodness and mercy follow us. May we be the beneficiaries of Thy higher wisdom, to the end that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will may be done on earth.

In the Redeemer's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 14, 1970, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclu-